

THE CHRISTIAN REVIEW.

No. CVII.—JANUARY, 1862.

ARTICLE I.—EARLY MODERN BAPTISTS IN THEIR RELATIONS TO PEDOBAPTISTS.

THE history of any denomination of Christians, after it has attained a clear and recognized form, is easy to follow. The history of doctrines, either as separate, or as they generally cluster together in systems, is more difficult. And sometimes a single doctrine, or rite, or service, demands much more labor and care to trace out its course in the history of Christianity, than a harmonious set of doctrines. With the single doctrine, rite, or service, it may be requisite to ascertain when and where it has been held by individuals or small bands of disciples within the nominal limits of a national church, or some other ecclesiastical organization, and not merely as the distinctive tenet of a sect. And while we may expect to find a system of views at all times connected with the same general doctrines and usages as at present, single doctrines or rites must be sought over a wider field. They may be found not only along with such views and practices as now characterize their adherents, but also along with quite different ones, and even with some with which they are incongruous. But even where they have existed in such unfavorable or inconsistent connections, the fact of their existence may be as

clearly seen or proved as if they made part of a harmonious system.

That so much stress has commonly been laid on finding the doctrines and institutions of the New Testament in churches of former times, from which existing ones can prove their descent, is only in consequence of certain erroneous ideas respecting the doctrines and churches of our Lord. They are such as these, viz: that religious views, to give them actual and recognized existence, must be expressed and owned by an ecclesiastical organization; that there is only one true organized church of Christ; and that no Christian church can have existence and authority as a church except by actual transmission from the Apostles. It certainly is possible, to say the least, that some of Christ's instructions respecting doctrine or practice should not have been clearly seen combined and expressed through an organized body of his servants until the present day. The fact that they had no earlier discovery and development would, of course, be an objection to its claims which a new church must encounter, but which it would fairly meet and set aside, if it could show plainly that it rested on and was required by the Word of God.

These are considerations to which we must give full weight when we investigate the history of Baptist sentiments, and attempt to identify the places, and times, and circumstances, in which they have been held, as well as the persons who have held them. The views characteristic of Baptists may possibly be accepted by those who are in external connection with churches professing any system of doctrine not entirely unscriptural, and any form of church organization from prelatical to independent. Forgetting this, and proceeding as if it were necessary in order to prove the correctness of Baptist principles, that their churches should have existed through all the centuries since the Lord died, or that there should always have been a so-called Baptist Church, corresponding to the Roman Catholic or Episcopal, many have undertaken to show the existence of Baptist churches from manifestations of their sentiments, and have failed to prove any more than the latter fact. This has sometimes seemed, to both their friends

and opponents, to be a failure, because both have overlooked the fact that all we need is, that history should furnish evidence that disciples of Christ have, in former ages, found in the Word of God such views as Baptists now do. This case is similar to another. It would not be a fair demand that we must furnish an unbroken series of republics in every century, if we would prove that democratic principles respecting civil rights are very ancient, and the only just ones, and such as Christianity tends to bring into existence, and will ultimately make prevalent on earth.

In proceeding, then, to delineate the course by which Baptists attained their present distinct and separate position as churches of Christ, we find that their organization into churches in modern times is all that belongs to modern times; and that peculiar circumstances brought about the ecclesiastical separation of Baptists from those who held different views; and that for a long time they were existing among those from whom they differed in sentiment, while they did not give, and did not consider it necessary to give, their own views formal expression by means of distinct ecclesiastical bodies. It is only a short time since Edinburgh was pervaded with sorrow as the report spread that the lovely and beloved George Wilson, whom it cherished as a favored son and honored professor in its University, had closed his earthly course. He had been as decided as a Christian as he was eminent as a naturalist. But only positive knowledge of his views enabled any one to state correctly his true ecclesiastical position. He was trained among those who practise infant baptism, and lived and died in connection with a church of such sentiments; but still, as the result of conviction, he had embraced the views of Baptists, and received baptism as a converted man, from his friend the Rev. Dr. Innes, pastor of a Baptist church in Edinburgh. After this, inconsistently we think, he preferred to unite with an Independent church, and it was willing to receive him, notwithstanding the want of agreement in their views. This is precisely the course, in substance, which was taken by numerous Baptists in sentiment of former times. Many men have arrived at Baptist views who yet have

judged it, as Wilson did, unnecessary, unfit, or impracticable for them, for the sake of their opinions in this respect, to separate themselves from those whose views thus far differed from their own. If this has often been the case where churches were in existence which held the opinions of such persons, it is only reasonable to suppose that this course has been taken more frequently where no such churches existed, or if they did exist, were unknown or inaccessible to those who agreed with them in sentiment. What indications of Baptist views we can now find at periods somewhat remote, cannot, therefore, in fairness be regarded as any more than specimens, and not full catalogues of Baptists; just as the geologist finds here and there a specimen of whole families of plants or animals which once existed in abundance, and are surely known to have existed through the preservation of a few individuals of the class to which they belong.

There is one more point which must not be overlooked in tracing the history of Baptist views. The great distinction of Baptists is, the rejection of infant baptism as unscriptural, and opposition to it as anti-scriptural, because it misrepresents and opposes the true meaning and use of the initiatory ordinance of Christianity. It is easy to conceive of Christians who reject infant baptism, and yet practise or permit various modes of baptism; and of others who strictly adhere to immersion, while willing to administer the rite to infants as well as believers. The Anabaptists of Germany did not rebaptize for the sake of immersing, for they did not confine themselves to this mode of baptizing.* Others, like Chauncey, the second president of Harvard College, and Wall, the author of the well known *History of Infant Baptism*, may maintain that immersion alone is baptism, but favor the administration of the rite to children. It is, however, a fact worthy of notice, that in our own day, no ecclesiastical body is distinctly opposed to the baptism of children, except those who maintain that every mode of baptizing, other than by immersion, is a

* See Spanheim and Meshovius in Stennett's answer to Russen, pp. 242, 243; likewise, *Christian Review*, July, 1861.

corruption of the ordinance ; and no Protestant body holds this view of the mode of baptism, except those who reject the baptism of infants. Because this is now the case, Baptists should guard themselves against requiring, and they should not let others require, both of these characteristics as proof of the existence of Baptist sentiments at remote dates in Christian history. Any person who maintains that immersion alone is the baptism enjoined in God's Word, to this extent holds Baptist sentiments ; although he is less decidedly a Baptist than he who opposes infant baptism, just so far as the former is of less consequence than the latter. And when those who reject infant baptism find themselves among those who hold baptism to be immersion, and anything else exceptional and to be admitted only for reasons which excuse it, of course the rejection of infant baptism suffices to render them Baptists. And even in case something else than immersion is occasionally practised, without an attempt to defend it, the common assent to true views will prevent any issue from being joined on this point, just so long as no one attempts to defend the equal validity with immersion of the departure from it ; and then there will be no distinct traces of what we now call Baptist views, except in the form of opposition to infant baptism, or of the rejection of that rite.

With these considerations in mind, we proceed to look back for Baptists, and to trace out their relations in former times to those who differ from them in those points which are peculiar to them.

For right guidance in our question, we must ascertain what has generally been regarded as the primitive form of the rite of baptism. There had ceased to be much disagreement respecting the act described by the word and respecting primitive usage, when, as it would seem, mainly for this reason, the general consent of Christendom began to be objected to, as without support. But it is a singular fact that scholars generally yielded the claims of Baptists, when they were allowed by truth and candor to reject these. Mere assertion cannot counteract the influence of this fact.

When we attempt to disprove the charge, that without

reason we have assumed, and others have conceded, that baptism in primitive times was, and in ritual meaning is, immersion, all that can be demanded of us is to show that the word has this meaning fixed on it by classic usage, when employed in its proper sense, and implied, when employed less literally or figuratively. It is preposterous to demand, besides this, that we prove by accompanying descriptions and explanations, that the word, in any particular instance, delineates the act which it properly and ordinarily means. Those who deny this proper and ordinary meaning in such instance, must show that the usage is exceptional, and on what grounds the general meaning of the word must be relinquished.

But we may volunteer to go further, since the rite of baptism has so often been described in early Christian writings, which are readily accessible. In the epistle which bears the name of Barnabas, and is referred to the early years of the second century by those who do not admit that Paul's companion was its author, we find, chap. xi, language like this: "We descend into the water full of sins and defilement, and come up out of it bearing fruit, for we have in our hearts fear, and in our souls hope in Christ." Similar language is found in Book III., Simil. ix, section 16, of the Shepherd of Hermas, which, at the latest, must be dated before A. D. 150. Hermas says, that the candidates "descend into the water sentenced to death, but they ascend from it sealed unto life." Besides this, the descriptions of baptism furnished by Justin Martyr, of the same century, are well known as describing immersion, but nothing else. His testimony may be found in Wall's *History of Infant Baptism*. Bunsen has furnished in his "*Hippolytus*," several quotations from the bishop of Ostia in the early part of the third century (whose name was Hyppolytus), which speak as distinctly of the immersion of the baptized as of their personal and oral profession of faith. We also find in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, Book III., sec. 16, direction given to the Bishop or Presbyter, to "dip the candidates in the water." All the latest editors refer the first six books of this work to the end of the third century. A writer in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* of January, 1858, charges Neander

and Bunsen with "taking up the belief in the confessed absence of any historical evidence to that effect, that immersion was the mode of baptism first practised in the Christian Church." He should have extended his list of names from our own time back to the first ages of Christianity, in order that it might be complete, and he might then have undertaken to furnish a more general explanation of this singular belief, which, without any foundation, has yet been so prevalent. But until this is done in some way by which all the testimony of antiquity shall be overbalanced, we must adhere to it, and especially since it alone accords with the literal meaning of the word baptize, and with the figurative references made to it in the New Testament.

Not merely Baptists, but Wall, in his *History of Infant Baptism*, has furnished as much evidence of the practice of immersion until modern times, as could be asked or expected in case of a general usage.* Under such circumstances, to find those whom we may claim as Baptists, we cannot look for any distinctive mark excepting opposition to infant baptism. But when immersion began to be generally set aside, adherence to it would constitute an additional occasion as well as mark of anti-pedobaptism. In accordance with this, Wall asserts, II: 220, that in France, where immersion was first set aside, along with this change, and in consequence of it, Baptist views were distinctly manifested.

John iii: 5: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God," was understood by some in early times as meaning that baptism is essential to salvation. The sentiment spread, and may be said to have soon become the prevalent one among Christians, at least as much and as far as infant baptism prevailed. Wall goes so far as to affirm, that he never saw it applied in any writer from Justin Martyr to Augustine, otherwise than to baptism. And his opinion was that Calvin is the first author that denied the meaning of the passage to be baptism.† The

* See Wall, Vol. II, pp. 220, 357, 358, 359, 361, 362, 363, 367, 370, 384.

† Ibid., II, 165, 166. The edition of Wall to which we refer is that of London, 1720.

truth of the statement respecting the meaning assigned to this verse, must be admitted in the main, but not universally. That interpretation accounts for the prevalence of infant baptism ; and is necessary to account for it in opposition to primitive practice. But it may refer to baptism as connected with salvation, and not conflict with the baptism of converts alone, any more than another declaration of Christ's, viz., "He that believeth not shall be damned," conflicts with the salvation of infants, while even Wall gives the evidence that opponents of infant baptism existed long before modern times. The truth is, there is no evidence that infant baptism was even known to the early Christian Church. Then, passing by the Novatians, and Donatists, and ancient British Christians, and a part of the Waldenses, and the followers of Berengarius, and a portion of the Cathari, the Publicani, and the Beghards of Bohemia, because there has been so much dispute respecting them, we would, to prove the existence of opponents of infant baptism, amid all the errors of the times when the hierarchy of Rome held almost unchallenged sway in Europe, rather rely on facts like the condemnation, by the two Lateran Councils of 1139 and 1215, of those who rejected infant baptism, and denied the utility of the ordinance. Wall says, likewise, that in the Decretals, a letter of Innocent III. to the Bishop of Arles exists, which is an answer to a statement of the latter, that some heretics had taught there that it was to no purpose to baptize children, since they could have no forgiveness of sins thereby, as having no faith, charity, etc.*

It is most probable that, while there were bodies of Christians which, like the Petrobrussians, held Baptist views, and were of sufficient magnitude to attract the notice of the authorities of the Church generally, such persons existed in the Church as isolated individuals, or as mere companions of sympathizing disciples who met for mutual comfort and instruction. The common opinion that a Divine right to ecclesiastical authority was received by regular transmission from the Apostles, would deter disciples from breaking away to

* Wall's History of Infant Baptism, Vol. II, p. 242.

form new churches. The Methodists were at first thus deterred. The Plymouth Brethren are now influenced in the same way. Such a Church probably was that to which Robinson refers as existing at Chesterton in 1457.* The same would seem to have been the case with several other old churches, as Ivimey calls them, which existed in Kent and elsewhere near London.

It was quite usual for the Roman Catholic Church to have nominal adherents who dissented materially from its authorized dogmas ; and its many councils show how much trouble such persons gave it. But only with the Reformation did these dissenters begin to organize themselves into religious bodies of homogeneous views. They therefore are not to be looked for in modern times until this period ; and even after it, "the necessity of separation" from the Church of Rome, and then from the National Churches, was slowly discerned and reluctantly admitted. Canne's work on "Separation," and the differences in the English Church at Amsterdam about conforming with the Church of England, fully illustrate this. But before this was seen as a duty, no Protestant Church could be found in England, or elsewhere, independent of the one established by law. The Puritans of England very reluctantly abandoned the hope of restoring the established Church to a close conformity in doctrine and services to the New Testament. Those who saw that the attempt was futile, even then felt it necessary to cast the blame of their course very distinctly on their mother Church, that they might have the justification of necessity in the step which they trembled to take. But when they thus had left it, their principles soon led them to the welcome discovery that the New Testament authorizes a body of believers to constitute themselves into a Church of Christ, without receiving authority, or a ministry, from any previously existing Church. Into these new Churches, all of good repute who were willing to enter them, were admitted, with all those minor differences which were no barrier to communion in the established Church.

* Claude's Essay, &c., translated by R. Robinson, Vol. II., p. 44, Lond. 1788. See also Hopkins, The Puritans, Vol. II., p. 13.

What, then, were the prevalent views of baptism in the Church of England at this time? Wall furnishes sufficient evidence that immersion was generally practised until the seventeenth century. He refers on this point to a canon of an English council held in the year 816. As quoted by him from Spelman, it forbids priests to pour water on the heads of infants, and requires them to be "always dipped in the font." In one of his colloquies Erasmus refers to infants as immersed in England in the sixteenth century, while in the Prayer Book of Edward VI., belonging to about the same period (1549), immersion is enjoined and affusion allowed only in case of weakness. Wall, sustained by others, claims that immersion maintained the ascendancy also through the reign succeeding Edward's.*

In this state of matters there was less occasion for the separation of Christians into distinct Churches, on the ground of baptism, than when Calvin had in his "*Service Book*" prescribed sprinkling as baptism. There was no more, in fact, than members of Pedobaptist Churches now have for a separation from such Churches because they do not believe infant baptism to be of Divine authority. Not being required to have their own children baptized, and the rite being generally discarded by the members of the church, they remain quiet in their position because they are not actually molested, or offended by the general action of the church, but find it instead for the most part sanctioning their views. We learn, as a matter of fact, that the formation of distinct Baptist churches in England, and the substitution of pouring and sprinkling for immersion, were contemporaneous. Along with this change of the rite, and probably in part out of the discussions and study of baptism which it caused, sprang up the opposition to infant baptism of those who clung to immersion. Logic required that the latter be opposed on the very same grounds on which the former was maintained.

Facts like the following are well established: Baptists, and even Baptist ministers, remained in the Church of Eng-

* Hist. of Infant Baptism, Vol. II, pp. 359-370.

land after the rise of the Independent and other dissenting churches ; such ministers were sometimes recognized by public authority as regular clergymen ; and they were not, until the restoration of Charles II., excluded from parochial charges. Even among those who had separated from the Established Church, the questions between Baptists and Pedobaptists were not used as a rule of fellowship ; and a change of views in a pastor did not necessarily dissolve his connection with his charge—a Baptist sometimes being pastor of a church not Baptist, and vice versa. It was after a long interval that Baptists began generally to form what they called “gathered churches.” The name indicates that these were composed of members previously scattered among different churches of various views. The attempt to gather them met with opposition of long continuance, which did not subside until increased light, experience of the difficulty of intimate communion where so great dissimilarity of views existed, or such necessity as the act of Parliament of May, 1648* created, had made the conviction general among the Baptists, that they must take this course.

As we shall proceed to show, Wall makes a correct representation of the facts in the case, when he says, that “it is to be noted that when this opinion (anti-pedobaptism) began first to increase, they did not all of them proceed to separation from the Established Church; they held it sufficient to declare their sentiments against infant baptism, to reserve their own children to adult baptism, and to be baptized with it themselves, without renouncing communion in prayers and in the other sacraments, with the Pedobaptists.”† When, in the year 1645, Marshall had charged the Baptists with “the sin of separation,” Tombes replied, that only some went so far, that it was the fault of the persons, not of their Baptist views, and that he himself “abhorred” such action. He likewise referred to the “confession of seven (Baptist) churches” as expressing the views which he held. Ivimey supposes that Tombes persisted in these senti-

* Ivimey's Hist. of the Baptists, Vol. I., p. 200. † Wall, Hist. of Infant Baptism, Vol. II., p. 294.

ments, and never relinquished his connection with the Established Church.* This may be correct, but there is evidence against it. In 1653, his name as pastor of the church at Lin-tile, Herefordshire, is found subscribed to an address sent to the Baptist Church at Hexham by a large number of sister churches. It was evidently a "baptized church" of which he was then pastor.† But we also know that he experienced ill-treatment during the commonwealth which would have a tendency to render him a more decided Baptist. When he was minister of Fenchurch, attempts were made to prejudice his parish against him as an "Anabaptist;" and his stipend was withheld from him because he would not baptize infants, although no charge of introducing the controversy on baptism in his ordinary services could be brought against him. John Canne was connected with a church averse to separation. In 1641 he assisted Mrs. Hazard and her friends in forming a Baptist Church at Bristol. These disciples after this met as a church, usually in private houses, but they, besides, still retained their connection with the Established Church.‡ The Baptists at Bewdley also, to whom Tombes preached at about this time, were communicants of Baxter's Church at Kidderminster, while Tombes himself was at the same time parish minister of Bewdley.§ When the Baptists at Bedford, in 1650, formed themselves into a Church, "the more ancient professors being used to live, as some other good men of those times, without regard to such separate and close communion, were not at first so ready to fall into that godly order."|| A few years before this (1647), John Gibbs, the ejected minister of Newport Pagnell, in vain exerted himself to induce the Baptists to take such a course as this. He "wished to have brought them into a regular church state, and took great pains for this purpose, but could not succeed." The Rev. Nathaniel Ingello, D.D., one of the first pastors of the Broadmead Church

* Hist. of Baptists, Vol. I, pp. 181, 264.

† Records of Churches at Fenstanton, &c., p. 344.

‡ Ivimey, Hist. of Bap., Vol. I, p. 160.

§ Ivimey, Hist. of Bap., Vol. I, p. 264; Vol. II, p. 589.

|| Ibid., Vol. II, p. 21.

of Bristol, was minister of the parish of All-Saints of that city, and preached each sabbath, in its church in the morning, and to the Baptists in the afternoon; and Mr. Ewins, who was pastor of the same Baptist church from 1651 through several years, preached at Christ Church a part of the time, and yet continued preaching to the * Baptist church in the various parish churches of the city, until he was ejected at the Restoration. This minister was not himself baptized until three years after he became pastor of this Baptist church, and then remained in the Established Church until his ejectment in 1662; after which, taking an unusual course, he received ordination as a dissenting minister.† Rev. James Lickelmore, minister of the parish of Singleton, near Chichester, was convinced that infant baptism is wrong, by means of the form given in the Prayer Book for administering baptism, and consequently became a Baptist, but yet he did not cease to be minister of the parish.‡

These instances are sufficient to show how gradually Baptists formed distinct churches, and how common it was for them to deny the necessity of doing this; and that, like the Puritans, they disagreed among themselves in regard to remaining in connection with the Established Church, and worshipping with it, and that there was need of such arguments as Canne used in his "*Necessity of Separation*" to bring them as Baptists to their true position as witnesses for Christ. They also prove, like the article of the Confession of the Seven Churches, that Baptists left the Church of England only after having tried to secure for themselves a home there which their consciences would allow them to occupy. But, besides this, they are of use to explain much which is perplexing in the history of those who held Baptist sentiments at this time in England, where there is clear evidence of their connection with the Established, or some other Church. They were Baptists nevertheless, just as the Wesleys were Metho-

* Ivimey, Hist. of Bap., Vol. II, pp. 528, 529.

† Ibid., Vol. II, p. 86.

‡ Ibid., Vol. II, p. 568.

dists, although they remained in the Church of England.* In this way Roger Williams is erroneously denied to have been a Baptist except for the short period of his connection with the Baptist Church of Providence. It might as well be claimed that Dunster and Chauncey, the first two presidents of Harvard College, were not Baptists; nor those persons who were members of the Pilgrim Church at Plymouth, and known by them as Baptists. On the same account it is impossible to find out at exactly what date Hanserd Knollys became a Baptist; and so also we account for not finding any traces among us of Thomas Patient, another Baptist minister, who lived for a time in Massachusetts colony, who was a prominent man among his brethren, and after laboring for some time in Ireland, in the middle of the 17th century, closed his life in 1666, as an elder of the Church in Devonshire Square, London. We are, perhaps for the same reason, without any information from the colonial records respecting other Baptist ministers, who are said to have resided in our country for a time. We can account for all these cases in the same way—their sentiments made them Baptists, and not their ecclesiastical relations.

During the civil troubles of England, Baptists were not merely willing to remain in connection with the Established and other Churches, but they were treated by the government in the same way as other Christian ministers. To one form of this, permission to retain their benefices, we have already referred. This, however, was done in a still more open way, when they received appointments to public service under special acts of Parliament. A case of this kind occurred under an act passed March 12th, 1649, "to send over six able ministers to preach in Dublin" at the expense of the government. One of these was the Rev. Thomas Patient, above mentioned, and the Dublin Cathedral was the place where he usually preached. Another Baptist minister, the Rev. Christopher Blackwood, appears to have been associated with Patient in

* The same course, it may be added, was taken by the first Presbyterians in England, even when, in 1572, eleven Elders formed a Presbytery at Wadsworth. Hopkins, *The Puritans, &c.*, Vol. II., p. 264.

this service at Dublin. It is not unlikely that General Fleetwood, Cromwell's son-in-law and Lord Deputy of Ireland, had a hand in these appointments, as he showed not a little favor to Baptists.* It is also worthy of notice that, when Cromwell became Lord Protector, among those appointed chaplains in ordinary was Rev. Daniel Dyke, a graduate of Cambridge, who was so strict a Baptist that he had, on account of his sentiments, surrendered his living in 1640. Cromwell also appointed him, with his Baptist brethren, Tombes and Jessey, among those who should be "Triers," and to whom was assigned the work of approving and admitting to benefices such persons as they considered qualified. This, it will be noticed, conferred on them almost Episcopal powers. Under their influence it may have been that Henry Denne, who had in 1644 been arrested in Cambridgeshire and imprisoned in London for preaching against infant baptism, obtained and held for two years the parish of Elsly, in Cambridgeshire.† And it may have been through them also, that William Dell, a Baptist minister, held the parish of Yeldon, in Bedfordshire, until 1662, when the act of Uniformity ejected him from this, and also the mastership of Gonville and Caius College, in the University of Cambridge, where he had received his education.‡ It was on account of such cases, that Baptists were as a class excepted from restoration to benefices, or forbidden to retain them, when Charles II. was settling the affairs of Church and State. And on consulting the list of ministers who were ejected from livings by the "Act of Uniformity" of 1662, we shall learn that the number of these was not small. We have identified, in Palmer's list, forty-six Baptists; and a more perfect knowledge of the times and men would probably enlarge the number.§

The "Act of Uniformity" of 1662, was merely a fresh outbreak of feelings which existed in former years, and reminds one, if we may not call it a repetition, of a law passed May 2,

* Ivimey, *Hist. of Bapt.*, Vol. II., p. 327.

† Wilson, *Hist. and Antiq. of Dissenting Churches*, Vol. II., p. 441.

‡ Ivimey, Vol. II., p. 55.

§ See Palmer's *Non-conformist's Memorial*, and Ivimey, Vol. I. p. 328.

1648, which bore very severely on Baptists in one of its articles, although the disorder of the times probably prevented its enforcement. That article was as follows: "whosoever shall say, that the baptism of infants is unlawful, or that such baptism is void, and that such persons ought to be baptized again, and in pursuance thereof shall baptize any person formerly baptized, etc., shall, upon conviction by the oath of two witnesses, or by his own confession, be ordered to renounce his said error in the public congregation of the parish where the offence was committed; and in case of refusal, he shall be committed to prison until he find sureties that he shall not publish or maintain the said error any more."* No prosecutions under this law are on record; but this, with the subsequent legislation, shows the existence of a spirit which would compel Baptists to form distinct churches, if not to struggle for existence against legal pains and penalties. And in such a state of matters, it would not be strange if many felt that their brethren did wrong who remained in communion with the Established Church of a kingdom which thus enacted laws against Christ's servants and truth. External circumstances, long existing, at length forced those who held Baptist views into distinct organizations of their own, even when they were disposed to remain, and felt no scruples about remaining, in the Established Church of the nation.

The Baptists whom we have been considering, corresponded to, or may be called a division of, those Puritans who did not regard it as obligatory or advisable to separate themselves from the Church of England because they did not believe that God's Word forbade all ecclesiastical communion with erroneous views of the ordinances, although they felt obliged for themselves to adhere exactly to its positive instructions respecting them. But even among those Puritans who were called Separatists, because they had withdrawn from the Church of England, and were opposed to communion with it, the differences on the subject of baptism were not regarded as requiring their separation from each other into distinct

* Ivimey, *Hist. of Bap.*, Vol. I., p. 200.

bodies. They may be well enough represented by the account which Gov. Winslow gives of the connection of Baptists with the Plymouth Church. In his "*True Grounds or Cause of the First Planting of New England*," after admitting that a law existed in Massachusetts colony against the Baptists, he states that they (of Plymouth) "had men living among them—nay, some in their churches," of Baptist views, whom they would leave to God, "as long as they carried themselves peaceably as they hitherto had done."* On such terms Baptists remained in connection with the Independent churches, in many cases for a long time after the strict Puritans had formed distinct churches. And it is a matter of much interest to notice how these two elements were combined for so many years in England, in Holland, and in America, and how at last they became more distinct.

When Robert Browne escaped from England, in 1582, along with a company of those who had separated from the Established Church and embraced views now known as Independent or Congregational, he directed his steps to Middleburg, in Holland. There were many Dutch Baptists in this city, and the English were drawn into much intercourse with them. The result was, that "the greater part of the exiles adopted their views."† This was as soon as 1584, because in this year Browne returned, by way of Scotland, to England, where he soon renounced those views which had rendered him one of the most strict and severe of the opponents of the Established Church. A few years later, that company of Christians which is now generally regarded as the mother-church of the Pilgrims, was formed at Scrooby, Nottinghamshire, under the charge of Richard Clifton and John Robinson. After enduring much persecution, in 1608 this church removed to Amsterdam. The chief reason for taking this course was probably the severity with which the Act of Parliament of February 19th, 1691, bore upon them. This sentenced to perpetual banishment from the realm all those who would not attend the

* Young's *Chronicles of the Pilgrims*, pp. 404, 405.

† *Struggles and Triumphs of Relig. Liberty*, p. 160. *Broadmead Records*, p. 35. See also Neal, *Hist. of Puritans*, Vol. I., p. 149.

parish services of the Established Church, those who would not acknowledge the queen's authority in ecclesiastical matters, and those who, having been present at an unlawful religious meeting, on conviction of the offence, would not, within three months, relinquish their errors.*

These exiles found at Amsterdam an English church, formed in 1592, of which Francis Johnson and Henry Ainsworth and John Smith were ministers; but, instead of joining with them, they hired a meeting-house for themselves, and formed a church after the Brownist model,† as some say, while others say that they united with the existing church. But they, at any rate, found Amsterdam an uncomfortable place; and within about a year they removed to Leyden, where they found a home until 1620, when the most of them left Holland for America, to plant the colony at Plymouth. The reasons assigned for this step were, the death of aged members, the intermarriage of the young people with Dutch families, the decline of their numbers, and the absence of any prospect of toleration at home.‡

The church found at Amsterdam by the exiles of 1608, was, in part, formed of those who had been members of a Separatist church which had been gathered in London in 1592, with Francis Johnson as its minister.§ Mr. Smith had been a minister of the Established Church at Gainsborough, Lincolnshire, had there embraced Separatist views, and collected a church of these sentiments, and had emigrated to Holland two years before those who went from Scrooby.|| The same year Smith adopted such views of doctrine as soon after and henceforth were known as Arminian, along with Baptist views of the ordinances, and he drew over to his sentiments a large portion of the church. These were "excommunicated by the rest," as Johnson testified, or "forthwith expelled," as Steven

* Neal, *Hist. of Puritans*, Vol. I., p. 198. Wilson, *Hist. and Antiq. of Dissenting Churches*, Vol. I., p. 21.

† Wilson, Vol. I., p. 31.

‡ Ibid., Vol. I., p. 32. Winslow, in *Young's Chronicles of the Pilgrims*.

§ Ibid., Vol. I., p. 18.

|| Ibid., p. 28.

says, in his history of the Rotterdam church.* These Baptists were thus driven from the first English Baptist church in Holland; and it published, in 1611, the first confession of faith given to the world by English Baptists. Not long after, Smith having died in 1611, this church, with its pastor, Thomas Helwysse, feeling doubtful respecting its right to remain in comfortable exile, determined to return to England and share the persecutions borne by their brethren—"to challenge king and state to their faces, and not give way to them, no, not a foot."†

So early and clearly did the first churches which separated themselves from the Church of England find the Baptist element among them. This, in fact, was claimed by Baptists and charged by others, as the proper result of the principles on which the Independents and others left the Established Church. Bishop Saunderson is quoted by Underhill as saying:‡ "The Reverend Archbishop Whitgift and the learned Hooker, men of great judgment and famous in their times, did long since foresee and declare their fear, that if Puritanism should prevail among us, it would soon draw in Anabaptism after it. . . . They considered, only as prudent men, that Anabaptism had its rise from the same principle the Puritans held." In these cases, probably on account of the Dutch Baptist churches surrounding them, and the treatment they experienced in Amsterdam, those who embraced Baptist views formed themselves into separate bodies more promptly and generally than their brethren in England. But still they did not draw away from the other churches all the Baptists, or they were not expelled as at Amsterdam, since Winslow, as quoted above, testifies, that those who came from Leyden to this country had Baptists among them.

Early in the seventeenth century, we learn that meetings of Separatists in and around London began to attract the attention of the authorities. In 1616, an Independent Church was

* *Struggles and Triumphs of Religious Liberty*, p. 197. Canne, *Nec'y of Separation*, p. 27.

† *Ivimey*, Vol. I., p. 122. *Struggles and Triumphs, &c.*, introduction, p. 8.

‡ *Struggles and Triumphs of Religious Liberty*, p. 195.

formed in London by Henry Jacob. He had left England in 1593, for Holland, and there opposed and wrote against the extreme Romanist views of Francis Johnson and others, that the Established Church of England is not a true Church of Christ. In 1609 or 1610, while visiting Leyden, he had an interview with John Robinson, and embraced his moderate independent views of church government. It was immediately after his return to London that he commenced the formation of the above church. It is impossible to determine its location, probably because it had no fixed one, but from the attitude of government, smallness of numbers, and scantiness of means, was compelled to meet in different private houses. We know that Jacob's successor, Lathrop, was arrested with many of his church, in 1632, at Barnet's house in Blackfriars; and also that, in 1638, a large number of members of the same church were seized while attending a meeting in Queenhithe, opposite Southwark, and that in 1653 the church met, with H. Jessey as its pastor, in Swan Alley, Coleman street.*

In 1624, Mr. Jacob having emigrated to the colony of Virginia, Mr. John Lathrop became pastor of the church. In 1632, along with forty-two of its members, he was seized at Humphrey Barnet's while holding a meeting, and kept in prison until 1634, when he was released, after the others, on condition of leaving the country. In company with about thirty of his members he came to New England, and they formed the first church in Scituate, near Plymouth, from which place he removed with some friends to Barnstable, in 1639.† After this date, it is difficult to continue the list of pastors of Jacob's church, and to trace its history, because the common account is manifestly incorrect; and yet we have not as full and clear statement as we could desire for its correction. And it is just at this time also, that it begins to be connected with Baptists.

* Neal's account, the one generally accepted, is, that John Canne succeeded Lathrop, and was himself succeeded first by

* Wilson, Hist., etc., of Diss. Churches, Vol. I., 36-43. Fenstanton Records, pp. 345, 346, 336.

† Deane, Hist. of Scituate, p. 59. Neal, Hist. of the Puritans, Vol. I., p. 361.

Samuel Howe, and then by Stephen More. In this way the history of the church is brought down to 1641, when sixty of the members were arrested at a meeting in Southwark. Neal says, that an abstract of the church books shows that this was Morse's church ; but it is called by Fuller, and stated in the "Journal of the House of Lords" to have been an "Anabaptist" meeting.*

This account cannot be accepted, because it covers a period, 1634-1641, respecting which we have other conflicting, and yet credible statements. We know that Lathrop was not released from prison until 1634, and also, from the Life of Henry Jessey, that the latter went up to London in 1635, and was shortly after solicited to take charge of L.'s church, which, after protracted consideration, he did in 1637, and remained in charge of it until his death, September 4th, 1663.† But besides this, there is difficulty also in accepting as true the reference which Neal's account makes to Canne. His "*Necessity of Separation from the Church of England*" bears the date of 1634, while he adds to his name the designation of "Pastor of the Ancient English Church in Amsterdam." He was then pastor in Amsterdam at the time when Neal assigns him to the church in London. But, further, we know, from the records of the Broadmead Church of Bristol, that "Mr. Canne, a baptized man, the same that made notes and references upon the Bible," aided in the formation of that church, April 25th, 1641. He says himself, however, that he spent seventeen years in banishment. Supposing that in 1641 he had been in England only a short time, the length of his exile would take us back about to 1622, when Steven, in his "*History of the Scottish Church in Rotterdam*," says, that he became pastor of the English Church in Amsterdam.‡

* Neal, Vol. I., p. 361, 362. Stovel's Int. to Canne's Nec'y of Separation, p. 13.

† Wilson, Hist., etc., of Dissenting Churches, Vol. I., p. 42.

‡ This was the so called "Ainsworthian" Church, which had separated from another, called after Francis Johnson, the "Franciscan." After Ainsworth's death, it is said that his church was divided again, a part adhering to Canne, and the rest to John de Cluse, or Lascluse. Wilson, Diss. Churches, Vol. I., pp. 22, 24. Brook, Lives of the Puritans, Vol. II., pp. 102, 301. Robinson's Works, Vol. III., pp. 127, 466. Steven, Hist. of the Scottish Church in Rotterdam, pp. 270, 271. Canne, Nec'y of Separation, p. 27.

We must then reject the statement that Canne succeeded Lathrop in London in or near 1634. But, can we then account for the double mistake of Neal and others, who reject the unquestionable records of Jessey's ministry in London, as well as place Canne there, when we know that he was out of the country? We have a solution of the matter, which we must accept until a better is furnished. Crosby quotes from a manuscript abstract of the records of an old London church the statement, that it was formed by Mr. Hubbard, or Herbert, about 1620, that John Canne was his successor, and that this church was distinct from Jacob's. Another account says, that it was formed from the latter church, emigrated to Ireland, where Mr. Hubbard soon died, and then it immediately returned to London, when Canne took charge of it for a short time before he felt it necessary to retire to Holland. Wilson expresses his confidence in Crosby's account, in preference to Neal's, and thinks that this church belonged in Southwark, and is the one of which the sixty arrested in Deadman's Place in 1641, were members, and of which Howe and More were ministers, the one from 1633 to 1640, the other after this. He says that More is the last person known as minister of the church, although it is supposed to have survived until persecution scattered it, about the time of the Restoration.*

In confirmation of this account, we know that there was another church in London in 1624, which was more strictly Separatist and Independent than Jacob's. The proof of this fact is furnished by a letter published in John Robinson's Works. It is dated in 1624, and was written to "The Congregational Church in London," as a reply to inquiries addressed by it to the London Church, concerning the propriety of recognizing the church under Jacob's care.† We have a clue to the origin of this inquiry in the fact that Jacob held, in opposition to the strict Separatists, that the Church of England is a true Church of Christ, notwithstanding its errors, and that it is not wrong to hold communion with it. Some think that there is in fact sufficient evidence that Jacob's was

* Wilson, *Diss. Churches*, Vol. IV., pp. 121-142.

† Robinson's Works, Vol. III, p. 379.

more nearly a Presbyterian than an Independent Church,* since he advocates departing "not one hair from Calvin and Beza touching" a presbyterian and synodal association of churches.

If this was Hubbard's church, then all clashing can be removed from the accounts furnished of the only ministers of the Independent Churches in London. And at the same time they furnish us with references to the connection of Baptists with them. We cannot claim that Canne was a Baptist at the time when he was minister of the first strictly Independent Church of London. His subsequent similar relation to the Amsterdam Church forbids this. But his successor, Samuel Howe, is claimed as a Baptist, and was famous in London, because, having died under excommunication from the Church of England, his friends were compelled to bury him in the highway, and he was thus put "under the hard necessity of passing to the next world through a part of the earth that had not received Episcopal benediction."† It was probably the notoriety which such treatment of this Baptist preacher gave his church that caused it to receive, as above stated, the designation of "Anabaptist" in the "Journal of the House of Lords" and elsewhere. John Canne, a minister at an earlier date, as we have already stated, was a Baptist in 1641, but we cannot now ascertain when he embraced such views. It does not seem that he could have been one in 1621, when he first left England, since at that date he became minister of the church in Amsterdam, and that church could not then have chosen for this position, a man with sentiments similar to those of Smith, whom it had just excluded for holding them. He probably was pastor of this church before he had embraced the sentiments of Baptists. This church was therefore not connected with Baptists, excepting through its pastor, Howe, so far as we now can clearly ascertain.‡

* Underhill, *Struggles, &c.*, of *Rel. Liberty*, p. 204.

† Wilson, *Hist. &c.*, of *Diss. Churches*, Vol. IV, p. 139.

‡ Rev. Dr. Waddington, the present pastor of the Southwark Independent Church, claims that it is the successor of the church of which Howe and More were pastors, and is the proper representative of the first Independent church

While the church which returned from Holland with Helwysse, as already stated, is the first English Baptist church of which we have positive knowledge from its very origin, some are confident that at an earlier date, another distinct church existed in London. In 1608, a small book was published by Enoch Clapham, with the title, "*Errors on the Right Hand, etc.*" In it a Baptist invites an Arian to attend a meeting of Baptists. Rev. Dr. Toulmin, in the "*Sketch of the History of English Baptists*" which he appended to Neal's History of the Puritans, represents these as the company of disciples which sent Richard Blount to Holland to receive baptism from

formed in London. We have seen that the first church was Jacob's, and that Jessey was pastor of this at the time when Howe and More were pastors of the church which they served. Then, if the present Southwark Church represents one of these bodies, it cannot represent the other. But he does not claim that his church is the successor of the one of which Henry Jessey was pastor, and we have shown that this was Jacob's Church, the first Independent one formed in London. As to the other church, Wilson says, that "it is very certain that the congregation lately assembling in Deadman's Place (the one of which Waddington is now pastor), can claim upon no good ground any relationship to the old church" in the same place; "much less has it any title to be distinguished, as it has been by many persons, as the oldest church formed on Congregational principles in England."* Mr. Wilson's opinion is only confirmed by a careful examination of Dr. Waddington's history of the Southwark Church. Tracing the church in the line of its pastors, and assuming that it is the one of which More had charge, he has no fact with which to fill the interval between 1641 and the ministry of Thomas Wadsworth, of which we now know only, that it began after the great fire of 1666. There is no evidence even that Wadsworth was minister of the same church. His successors, for a short time, were Richard Baxter and James Lambert, and their pastorates extended from 1676 to 1689. When we consider that Wadsworth was a Presbyterian, as well as Baxter, and that the latter probably did not differ much from his brethren in his views of the Independents, it is not credible either that Independents would have had them for ministers, or that they would have accepted the charge of such churches. Orme states distinctly what Baxter's feelings were. His language is, that he "regarded the whole (Independent) body with jealousy and dislike," and "was less friendly to them than to any other of the leading parties of his time."† These facts render Wilson's statement trustworthy, that this was a new Presbyterian church collected by Wadsworth. But after we have passed beyond this date, Dr. Waddington mingles the history of several distinct churches in order to complete the line of descent of the Southwark Church, according to his claim. This is plainly shown by Wilson in his "*History and Antiquities of the Dissenting Churches of London.*"

* Robinson's Works, Vol. III., p. 450. Wilson, Hist. and Antiq. of Diss. Churches, Vol. IV., pp. 121-142. † Life and Times of Baxter, Vol. I., p. 74.

the Dutch Baptists, so that he could administer the rite himself, and thus introduce it into England from an authorized source. After he had been baptized, he returned and baptized, first, Mr. Blacklock, and then, with his aid, fifty-two others. He says also, that the difference of views between this and Helwysse's church led the former to bestow the name of Se-baptists on the latter, because they maintained that any church could itself begin anew to administer correctly a corrupted ordinance of Christ, and that there was no need of effort by a church to secure baptism from the hands of one who had received it himself by transmission through a regular succession of ministers. Helwysse's church, after their founder, Smith, claimed, in his language, that a company of disciples formed into a church had power "*se ipsos baptizare*." Ivimey, however, speaks with much less confidence respecting this earlier church.*

After the removal of Lathrop from Scituate to Barnstable, which we mentioned above, Charles Chauncey, who, at a later day, became the second President of Harvard College, assumed the charge of the church at Scituate. He was a strenuous advocate of immersion. Similar views to his prevailed to some extent in this place, and it is probable that for this reason he gave this church the preference to that at Plymouth, which also desired him to settle with it, and promised to allow him to hold his views of baptism, and to administer the rite according to them, when any desired that he should do so. We have evidence of the existence of Baptist views among these colonists while in their mother church in London, as well as after their settlement in this country. Mr. Deane states in his History of Scituate, that "the controversy respecting the mode of baptism had been agitated among them before the colonists left England," and "those that came with Mr. Lathrop seem not all to have been fully settled on this point, and they found others in the place ready to sympathize with them."†

* Neal, Hist. of Puritans, Vol. II., p. 361. Ivimey, Hist. of Baptists, Vol. I., pp. 120, 143, 145.

† Hist. of Scituate, page 59.

As the persons here referred to came from the church formed in London in 1616, by Henry Jacob, it is evident that the first Independent church in England had the same experience of the discussion of the question of baptism as the older exiled church at Amsterdam. In the latter case, we have seen that the result of such a discussion was the formation of a church which became the first General, or Arminian, Baptist Church in London. The result in the former case was similar, for out of it issued another church, which was the first Particular, or Calvinistic, Baptist Church in London. This event occurred while Mr. Lathrop and his companions were confined in prison.*

The correctness of the common practice respecting baptism, in some way attracted their attention, as stated by Deane, and on the 12th of September, 1633, a portion of Lathrop's church, with John Spilsbury as its leader, amicably left the rest, and formed a Baptist church. Wilson says, that this separation arose from the action of a member in regard to the baptism of his child. Feeling some scruples respecting the validity of baptism by his own minister, he carried his child to the parish church to be baptized anew. At a meeting of the church his action was condemned, but still the majority were not prepared at that time to declare that parish churches were not true churches of Christ, as the rigid Separatists claimed. This class were displeased with the action of the church, and they consequently requested to be dismissed from it. They then united with some others, who considered the baptism of infants unlawful, and formed a Baptist church.† William Kiffin, who was a member of Lathrop's church, furnished a somewhat different account of the affair. He says, that "the church, considering that they were now grown very numerous, and so more than could in those times of persecution conveniently meet together, and believing also that these persons acted from a principle of conscience, and not from obstinacy, agreed

* For references to older churches than these, see Robinson's *Claude*, Vol. II., p. 14; Wall, *Hist. of Inf. Bap.*, Vol. II., p. 286 (ed. 1720); Ivimey, *Hist. of Bap.*, Vol. I., p. 108; II., 217—608; Neal, *Hist. of Puritans*, Vol. II., p. 363.

† Wilson, *Hist. and Antiq. of Dissenting Churches*, Vol. I., p. 41.

to allow them the liberty they desired, and that they should be constituted a distinct church. And as they (who formed the new church) believed that baptism was not rightly administered to infants, so they looked upon the baptism they had received at that age as invalid, whereupon most, or all of them, received a new baptism." The number of this company is stated to have been "twenty men and women, with divers others."* This church had its place of meeting in Wapping, at this time the extreme eastern part of London, near the Thames, and it survived until about 1740, in Broad street, Wapping. About 1730 a new church was formed from a portion of it, under the care of Samuel Wilson. The meeting-house of this church was erected in Prescott street, Goodman's fields, a short distance north-west of the location of the old church.†

The date of the formation of the first Baptist church in this country, as is well-known, is March, 1639. It was in the same year that another company of Baptists went out from the same church as the one just mentioned, but now under the care of Henry Jessey, to form a second church. The principal persons connected with this new body, were John Greene, Paul Hobson, and Capt. John Spencer. The place where this church met was Crutched Friars, Aldgate, some distance west of the location of the church already mentioned, and half-way between the Tower and the East India House. Greene was a very popular preacher; and Edwards in his "*Gangræna*," complains that when he preached there was "a great resort and flocking to him, so that yards, rooms and houses are all full," and the neighboring meetings were so thin that "Independents preached to bare walls and empty seats, in comparison of this great Rabbi."‡ Hobson was a captain in the civil wars, and must have been an educated man, since, at the Restoration, he was ejected from the chaplaincy of Eton College, which he then held.§ Spencer was

* Ivimey, Hist. of Bap., Vol. I., pp. 138, 139.

† Ibid., Vol. II., p. 434.

‡ Ibid., Hist. of Bap., Vol. II., p. 334.

§ Ibid., Vol. II., p. 87. Wilson, Vol. I., p. 54.

also a popular preacher. We know but little of him, except that he was summoned, along with Greene and others, before the House of Commons, in 1641, and "reprimanded and threatened" with punishment if they persisted in their preaching.* As Crosby says that Henry D'Anvers was connected with a church near Aldgate, it seems probable that this eminent man was minister of this church. This church survived until 1760, when, under the pastoral direction of Samuel Dew, it was dissolved, and the larger portion of its members united with the church of the Rev. Dr. Gill in Horsley-down.†

The year after this church had been formed, viz., 1640 appears to be the date of the commencement of another Baptist church. This one sprang out of the one which came forth from the first Independent church in 1633. It was led by William Kiffin, who so long and deservedly occupied the very first place among the Baptists of London. It had its origin in the aversion of a number of the members to the admission into the pulpit of preachers who had not been truly baptized. This touched the whole question of the agreement of pastors and churches in their views of the ordinances. We have seen that great laxity concerning this matter was at this time prevalent. The differing parties, however, separated amicably, and friendly relations were maintained between the old body and the new, notwithstanding their dissimilar views. Mr. Kiffin became pastor of the new church. He retained this charge for fifty years, and during that period, besides the prominent position which he held among his brethren, he was once elected an alderman of the city of London, and all the time held a high place among the most distinguished merchants of the city. This church had its location in Devonshire square, just off Bishopgate street, and some distance nearly north of Aldgate. It was yet in existence a few years since, and it is probable that it still survives. It is, therefore, worthy of notice, that the church which had its origin in the strictest maintenance of Baptist principles, should be the one

* Brook, *Lives of Puritans*, Vol. III., p. 529.

† Ivimey, Vol. II., pp. 334, 345; Wilson, Vol. I., pp. 393, 461.

the course of whose history to the present day is the plainest and most direct of all that were then existing.*

At no great distance in time from this division in Mr. Spilbury's church, another church was formed from the same Independent body as his had sprung from in 1633. Crosby, on the authority of a manuscript, says, that in 1640, the congregation under the care of Henry Jessey had grown so large that it could not meet with security in any one place. It therefore seemed necessary that the number should be reduced. "Just half" of the church consequently left Mr. Jessey, and formed a new body under Mr. Barbone. The records of the day associate his name with those of Greene and Spencer. In an account of the apprehension of all three, "amongst a hundred persons," December 19th, 1641, in Fetter Lane at Fleet street, Barbone is called "a reverend unlearned leather-seller." This was the location of Barbone's residence and business, but was at quite the opposite extreme of the "city" from Crutched Friars, where Greene's church held its meeting. Barbone is the member of Parliament whose name has been affixed in ridicule to Cromwell's Parliament of 1653, and his name was changed to Barebone to make the ridicule more effective.† But it is clear enough that he could not have been a man of low character, or mean position and talents, since he was selected to represent London, and took so prominent a position in a Parliament, "many of the members of which were persons of fortune and knowledge." What became of this church during the stormy days of the civil war and of the commonwealth, we are unable to say, as no traces of its history are at present known to be in existence.‡

In an account of Mr. Jessey which Ivimey furnishes, and which quite likely was the Life of Mr. J., reference is made to the formation of three Baptist churches from the Independent one of which Jessey had charge. "In 1638 six persons of note espoused Baptist sentiments. In 1641 a much greater

* Ivimey, Vol. II., p. 296. Wilson, Vol. I., p. 400.

† See Forster, Statesmen of the Commonwealth, p. 538; Neal, Hist. of Pur'ns, Vol. II., p. 362.

‡ Ivimey, Vol. I., p. 156. Wilson, Vol. I., p. 46.

number; and in 1643, the controversy was again revived among them, and a still larger number left them." The church thus formed at the last date, we cannot identify. That was, however, about the time at which Hanserd Knollys began to preach to a congregation in Great St. Helens, near Bishopsgate street. We know this from two facts. He was ordained as its pastor in 1645, after having preached to it two or three years; and when he died in 1691, it was said that he had been pastor of the church for fifty years. This church was still surviving a few years since, when it met in Red Cross street, having previously met for a time in Coleman street, and at Broken Wharf, as well as in the place where it commenced its meetings.*

At these different dates the church of Mr. Jessey lost many members who were held in high regard by him for their piety and good judgment. As their removal was connected with many discussions of baptism, he of necessity considered and studied the subject much. His extensive knowledge of the Word of God, and the thorough critical study which he had given to it in preparation for a revised English translation of it, furnished him with unusually good qualifications to investigate the subject of baptism with accuracy and faithfulness. Slowly, carefully, and after conferring with such ministers as Dr. Goodwin and Mr. Nye, he settled his opinions. He first relinquished his former views respecting the manner in which we are required by the Word of God to administer and receive baptism, and then, two or three years later, respecting the lawfulness of baptizing infants. At last, in June, 1645, he was baptized by H. Knollys. About the same time a number more of the members of his church also embraced his views. The change in Mr. J.'s views did not result in the termination of his pastoral connection with his people. But instead, he continued in this relation until his death, on the 4th of September, 1663, a few months after his release from imprisonment for disobeying the laws which forbade him to

* Ivimey, Vol. II., pp. 350, 359. Wilson, Vol. II., pp. 561, 584; Vol. III., p. 404. Fenstanton Records, p. 303.

preach. His church seems to have at last become composed, for the most part, of those whose sentiments agreed with their pastor's, and to have been regarded by Baptists as one of their churches, although it retained and admitted Pedobaptists as members. Letters written by it in 1653, when it met in Swan Alley, Coleman street, are still extant. They were written to the Baptist church in Hexham, and express the desire of Jessey's church to have fellowship with it, and "all the baptized churches which hold the truth purely;" and they also refer to "churches of our communion."*

After the death of Mr. Jessey, a dispute arose in his church respecting mixed communion, and those who opposed it separated from the others, and chose Mr. Henry Forty, one of their number, for their pastor. A few years later, in 1675, on the removal of Mr. Forty to Abingdon, in Berkshire, this new body connected itself with the church of William Kiffin; but the remainder of Mr. Jessey's church soon disappeared, and Wilson says that he could not discover what became of it.† Thus all that was left of the church of Henry Jacob, the first Independent one in London, was merged in that of Kiffin, which thus represents not only the first Baptist church founded on the plan of restricted communion, but also, more directly than any other existing church, the first Independent one in London.

Could the Independents of our day furnish the history of the part of Jessey's church which the strict Baptists left, and show the succession of any present church of their order from it, they could furnish the church which might claim to be the lineal successor of the church of Jacob. But this their own brethren, like Walter Wilson, deny that they can do; and its true history is, that after furnishing a number of Baptist churches from itself within the first twenty-five years of its existence, its pastor became a Baptist, and then, for the next twenty years, it was in fact a Baptist church by its own claim, and by the recognition of its sister Baptist churches, and finally

* Records of Churches of Christ gathered at Fenstanton, etc., p. 343.

† Wilson, Vol. I., p. 50. Ivimey, Vol. II., p. 430.

disappears, at the last point to which any part of it can be traced, in the Baptist church of the strictest sort in Devonshire Square.

To Baptists these facts respecting some of their first London churches, must be full of interest, especially as suggesting the existence of a principle somewhere inherent in the views of this Independent church, as well as others, which operated as the producing cause of so many Baptist churches. For this it may be worth while to seek, and we may yet reach the consideration of it.

But we must now turn again to the Baptist churches in London. Thus far, for some time, all have been passed by, except such as sprang from the first Independent church, but these were only a part of the churches in London which held Baptist views, so that this was not the only church from which they proceeded.

Thomas Edwards, in his bitter "*Gangræna*," which he published in 1646, has preserved much information respecting Baptists and Independents, although his representations of character and tenets are not to be trusted, and the last object in his view could have been to serve in any way the "Sectaries," whom he hated very thoroughly. He refers in a scurrilous manner to many of the Baptist preachers and churches of his day. Among other matters we learn from him that on November 12th, 1640, eighty Baptists, many of them belonging to the church of one Barber, met at a large house in Bishopsgate street, and had a love-feast, at which "five new members lately dipped were present." It is Edward Barber of whom he speaks. He was a person of much learning, who had been a minister of the Established Church, and had endured imprisonment for his change of views. In 1641, he published "*A Treatise of Baptism*," and was successful in gathering, as is said, "a numerous congregation."* Of the origin of this church no account is known to exist. The surname of its pastor corresponds, in its French form, with one of the names

*Ivimey, Vol. I., p. 162; Vol. II., p. 390. Brooks, *Lives of Puritans*, Vol. III., p. 330.

signed to the Confession of 1646, but the christian name is different. We do not find the name of Edward Barber attached to any of the Confessions of this period, and we find no authentic account of any French church, nor any record of it, excepting those names which were signed to the above Confession in behalf of such a church.

Edwards refers likewise to Thomas Lamb, and in no better mode than he does to Barber. Ivimey says, that his church was one of the first seven in London, and Baillie speaks of it as "by far the largest."* Its place of meeting was in Bell Alley Coleman street. As Mr. Lamb was brought to London from Colchester by Laud, on the charge of non-conformity, this must have been before December, 1640, when Laud was impeached and placed in custody. Shortly after this, July, 1641, a person of the same name was made vicar of South Benfleet in the same county as Colchester; there is, therefore, reason to suppose that it may have been this person. We find, likewise, that in January, 1643, he was engaged in a public discussion of baptism at Tarling, which, like the above places, was also in the county of Essex. It is probable that he came to London about this time, since Edwards refers to him and his church in Bell Alley, as early as this year. He continued to preach there until his decease in 1672, although he had his full share of the persecutions borne by those who persisted in their work from the Restoration until the Revolution. It is said that he endured imprisonment for preaching in almost every prison in and about London; and he used to say bravely, "That the man was not fit to preach who would not preach for God's sake, though he were sure to die for it as soon as he had done."

The records respecting Lamb's doctrinal views are curious. The General Baptists claim him. Edwards charged him with preaching Arminianism, while Baillie charged him with preaching both that and Antinomianism. The titles of some of his works indicate Arminianism; but others are in opposition to it. He must have changed his views during his ministerial life; or

* Ivimey, Vol. II., p. 386.

Vol. xxvii.*—3

else, like Baxter, Davenant, and Usher, and perhaps his brother Baptist,* Henry Denne, he always was a moderate Calvinist, and therefore likely to be charged by earnest advocates of that and the other side, with favoring the opposite extreme.*

There was yet another church, of the origin of which we lack definite information. It was the church at the Glass-House or Glazier's Hall in Broad or Thomas street. William Consett, who signed the Confession of 1651, and William Draper, were two of its ministers. From this church, in 1652, a church was formed which is still in existence, and of which the eminent Benjamin Keach was pastor for many years. Its first minister was William Rider, and among its later ones it enrolls the learned John Gill. It had no meeting-house until 1672, when it built one in Goat-Yard-Passage, on Horsley-down. It is claimed that this is the first Baptist church which practised singing in public worship.

But the church at Glazier's Hall has a place of special honor, from its connection with the Baptists in Wales and Ireland. It became acquainted with the brethren in Wales by means of a visit of two persons, who, after their conversion, went up to London in 1649, to obtain more complete religious instruction. Their names were John Miles and Thomas Proud; and as the first certainly became a minister of the gospel, and a church was formed at Ilston on their return, it seems quite probable that they were sent to the Baptists in London to obtain baptism from them, as Blount had been sent to Holland at an earlier day. But these were not the first in Wales who held their views of the ordinances. John Penry, who was put to death in 1593, is called an Anabaptist by Anthony Wood, and Powell, Cradock, and Jones were at this time preaching in Wales; but those who sent Miles and Proud to London, were peculiar as being opposed to mixed communion. The connection of the church with Ireland arose from, or was promoted by, the removal thither of its two ministers Consett and Draper, who soon died there. The

* Ivimey, Vol I., p. 170; Vol. II, p. 388; Wilson, Vol. II., p. 430-6; Brook, Vol, III., p. 462.

step taken by them may have been caused by the missionary spirit of the church, to which they probably contributed not a little. It is recorded, in proof of this, that just previous to the visit of the Welsh brethren, the church had observed a day of fasting and prayer, to implore the Lord of the harvest to send forth laborers into his harvest, especially in the dark spots of the land.*

Wilson states that still another Baptist Church was formed in Aldennanbury, near the Guild-hall, during the times of Cromwell. As Benjamin Cox's name is signed to the Confession of 1646, in behalf of one of the London churches, and, just before this, he had published "a Declaration concerning the public dispute which should have been in the public meeting-house in Aldennanbury, December 3d, 1645, concerning Infant Baptism," it seems probable that this refers to the place of meeting of which Wilson speaks, though it may refer to the Parish church, and that Cox was its minister. No further information respecting this church seems attainable. It is, however, known that the opponent whom Cox designed to meet was Edmund Calamy, D. D., then curate of St. Mary's, Aldennanbury. He had before this met at Coventry, for the same dispute, the famous Baxter, and received imprisonment for his defence of his brethren, whom he visited for the purpose of aiding them in forming a Church.†

While these are all the Baptist churches formed in London by the middle of the seventeenth century, whose names are still extant, and especially of those which agreed most closely in sentiment with Calvinistic Baptists of the present day, they are yet by no means all which then existed. A contemporary, and not a friend of theirs, Robert Baillie, makes the number much larger. In his "*Anabaptism the true Fountain of Independency, Brownism, Antinomy, Familism, etc.*," published in 1647, he says, "Their number till of late in England was not great, and the most of them were not English, but Dutch

* Wilson, Vol. IV., p. 241; Ivimey, Vol. I., pp. 235, 239; Vol. II., p. 359; Brook, Vol. II., p. 48.

† Ivimey, Vol. II., p. 15; Wilson, Vol. II., p. 524; Brook, Puritans, Vol. II., p. 418.

strangers ; for, besides the hand of the state, which ever lay heavy upon them, the labors of their children, the Separatists, were always great for their reclaiming. But under the shadow of Independency, the Anabaptists have lift up their heads, and increased their number above all the sects in the land. As for the number of these seven churches which have published their confession of faith, and for their other thirty-nine congregations (for before the penning of that confession, this sect was grown into forty-six churches, and that, as I take it, in and about London), they are a people very fond of religious liberty, and very unwilling to be brought under the bondage of the judgment of any other." *

As Baillie's book was published within less than fifteen years after the first Baptist church was formed from the first Independent one, this increase to nearly fifty churches is certainly very remarkable, as is the large proportion which their churches bore to the number of the inhabitants of London at this date, when it could not have amounted to more than 350,000.† But this large number of Baptist churches is more remarkable, because it would seem from the results of such investigations as those of Walter Wilson, Esq., that only a very few Independent churches existed in London at this time, and hardly any Presbyterian, until after the restoration of the Stuarts, so that it is quite probable that Baillie's account is correct, and the Baptists surpassed in numbers all other non-conformists in London at the middle of the seventeenth century.

And there were reasons for this rapid multiplication of Baptists at this time. They were almost the only Christians who were decided in their separation from the Church of England. They did not hope for its purification and continuance, as most of the Puritans who finally became Independents ; and they did not desire to substitute an Established

* Ivimey, Vol. II., p. 174.

† It was less than 300,000 in 1625. And afterwards the plague and the flight of many from the city reduced it very much. See Norton, *Commentary on the History, Constitution, etc., of the city of London*. Lond., 1829. Maitland's *London*. McCulloch's *Geog. Dictionary*.

Church of their own views for the existing one, as seems to have been the aim and hope of many Presbyterians. They went back to the first principles of the New Testament, and rested their plans and hopes entirely on them.

In doing this, besides, they were consistent Puritans and Separatists. The only sound justification of forsaking the Church of England they saw required them to go further; and in carrying out their principles, they found it necessary to adopt and hold the views which distinguished them. And those of their brethren who stopped short of this, were in the unpleasant position of men who use certain reasons to justify them in going as far as they wish to go, and then refuse to be under the control of these any further. All men of common sense saw that they should in fairness either deny the principles on which they depended, or carry them out to their full extent.

And that those views of the demands of religious principles came before the minds of Englishmen at a favorable time, is another reason for their acceptance by so large a number of religious people. Public affairs had arrested the attention of all classes, had awakened much thought respecting principles of action, and the rights of men, and the rules and demands of duty. Men were, to an uncommon degree, prepared to receive new light in respect to religious principles and duties, because they were receiving it in regard to civil matters, and the necessity of action at the demand and on the basis of the latter, in order to preserve their rights and freedom as Englishmen, prepared them for action in accordance with the former, also. The trammels of habit, and of precedent and authority were broken, or ready to break, in both cases. And as Baptist views were the only ones which bore out to their legitimate conclusions the principles on which the nation first opposed the wrongs of Charles I., and then endeavored to set up a Commonwealth, although Cromwell frustrated the plans, and disappointed the hopes of the truest and purest of them, it was only natural that the Baptists should find the way prepared for their sentiments, and "increase above every sect in the land."

But in addition to this, it seems easy to find in the principles which lay at the foundation of Independency, and even of Puritanism, that which not only sustained, but even demanded, the views and action of Baptists. This was seen and frequently pressed on the attention of Puritans by those who would keep them in connection with the Established Church, notwithstanding they were grieved at its retention of so much that was contrary to the Word of God. We can find illustrations of what has been stated, in the writings of the Puritans who had separated from the Church of England. As one, we may quote from Winslow's "*True Grounds of the Planting of New England*," the following language:* "And as the Churches of Christ are all saints by calling (Eph., v: 19—21; I Cor., vi: 9—11; Eph., ii: 11, 12), so we desire to see the Grace of God shining forth (at least seemingly, leaving secret things to God) in all we admit into church-fellowship with us, and to keep off such as openly wallow in the mire of their sins, that neither the holy things of God, nor the communion of saints may be leavened or polluted thereby." To appreciate the position of these Christian men, we must bear in mind the relations which civil authority had established between the Church and the Nation. John Robinson stated them when he complained that "Every subject of the Kingdom, dwelling in this or that parish, is bound, will he, nill he, fit or unfit, as with iron-bonds, to participate in all holy things, and some unholy also, in that same parish-church."† The ground which such a state of matters compelled the Puritans to take was strictly Baptist, although they were not aware of it, failed to adopt it, and consequently suffered in New England, until, in our own day, they have been compelled so fully to accept it in fact, and in violation of all that is involved in infant baptism, as to have forced from some the admission, in alarm, that a large part of the Congregational churches have become Baptist theoretically, with not a little danger that they may become so in actual practice.

* Young, *Chronicles of the Pilgrims*, p. 400.

† Ibid., p. 390.

In "The Necessity of Separation from the Church of England, proved by the Non-conformists' Principles," John Canne, while not yet a Baptist, stated many facts and principles which he merely followed out faithfully when he became "a baptized man." His definition of a church of Christ is such as required him in consistency to leave every other, and attach himself to one composed only of Baptist believers. "Our (the Non-conformist) definition of a true visible Church is, a company of people called and separated from the world by the Word of God, and joined together by voluntary profession of the faith of Christ, in the fellowship of the Gospel." "As for the visible churches planted by the Apostles, it is evident that in their collection they consisted of such, and none other, as were called by the Gospel, confessed their sins, believed, walked in the Spirit, and separated themselves from the false state in which they stood members before." In the maintenance of such views of a true Church of Christ, he held, or represented, Non-conformists as holding that "all wicked men are forbidden expressly by the Word of God from meddling with his covenant or ordinances"; "they are altogether incapable of this covenant"; "that which destroyeth a church, and makes it either to become a false church or no church at all, cannot be a true church, or true matter whereof it is made"; "they which have no right to the holy things of God in the church, are not to be admitted into it, neither is that church which is gathered of such persons rightly constituted;" "in this spiritual body, the members must be first united with Christ, the head, and become one with him, before they can in any way partake of his benefits."*

While this was originally directed against the corruptions of the Church of England, in which the distinction between the world and the Church of Christ had nearly disappeared, yet it applies in fairness and necessity equally well to every attempted covenant connection between unconverted persons and the Lord Jesus Christ. And had Canne chosen, he could have republished, in ten years, this same work, as a vindica-

* Necessity of Separation, pp. 195-197, 215, ed., 1849.

tion of his course, on the principles of the Non-conformists, in becoming a Baptist, and made it an appeal to his brethren to follow his example. And when disciples of Christ, who had contended against the Church of England on these grounds, on the one hand, felt the difficulty of thus qualifying their rejection of that church, while themselves holding to any covenant which gives a share in the Church of Christ through mere birth, and on the other, saw that the principles of Baptists were those which they had recognized and adopted as taught by the New Testament, but had not followed out, it was very natural that they should in great numbers have joined the churches of baptized disciples. And this was unusually easy under the circumstances of the nation during the civil wars and the Commonwealth, when, amid the civil and social changes, the Established Church itself had undergone its full share of the common experience. And besides, the Christians of those days, as much as any other subjects of Charles, could discover principles, and see clearly their importance. They had endured much for their sake, and borne much to oppose the denial or contravention of them, as in them lay the very essence of Puritanism. They had received them as an inheritance from their fathers, which had come into their hands only partially recognized by the civil and ecclesiastical authorities, and requiring yet many and large changes to remove ancient errors. They therefore felt the demands on conscience and action which principles require, more forcibly than men in other, and especially in these days of ours, of which nothing is more characteristic, while neither is any thing more full of peril, than that disregard of the logic of principles which denies that any thing is of vital importance, and refuses to adhere, through thick and thin, to what may be necessary for faithfulness to Christ, to truth, and to the welfare of men. But adherence to the teachings of Christ gave to Baptists in those days a power to attract humble and faithful Christians to themselves, which no other denomination had; and we now, as were our fathers two centuries since, are passing through an experience which will bring out and impress the value of moral and political principles; and if we stand firm, as we

have done at much cost hitherto, and count it an honor to be regarded as uncompromising where faithfulness to duty is involved, we may be confident that the day will come when our course will commend itself to the good sense and the conscience of true servants of Christ, and large accessions will again be made to our churches, of those who feel the obligation and appreciate the honor of following the teachings of the Lord to their full and legitimate results.

This is only more sure to be the case if the branches of Christ's Church which practise infant-baptism shall yield to the guidance which the *Mercersburg Review* in one way, and the *Princeton* in another, are laboring to give them, that they may be led back to the pernicious errors of former years, by which the size and the authority of churches may be enlarged, but at the cost of their purity. The mere definition of what a church of Jesus Christ our Lord is, does indeed bid fair once more to mark out the distinction between the faithful and unfaithful, and constitute the whole main field of battle between them.

But the Baptist churches at the time of which we write not merely grew rapidly, and comprised multitudes; they were also led by eminent men, and contained a good share of intelligent disciples. It was far from a despicable education of the intellectual and moral faculties for an individual in those days to make his way to, and embrace, and maintain the sentiments of the Baptists. As we have run over the list of early London churches, we have had before us the names of men who were prominent in our churches and elsewhere as Baptist Ministers, but would have been equally so had they remained in the Established Church, or belonged to any of the other divisions of Christians which at this time refused to conform to that church. Jessey and Canne and Knollys and Tombes and Dyke and Dell and Coxe and Barber and Lamb were well educated men, and might be reckoned among the scholars of a day when the scholarship of the English Clergy was superior to that of many other periods, and behind that of none, and no insignificant smattering of knowledge would have sufficed for them in a day of active and general opposition to their views, and when they

were compelled to maintain them against men of learning as extensive, if not as accurate, as England ever has possessed. Kiffin, also, the eminent merchant and alderman of London, who was for a long time the chief man among the Baptists of that city, and whom Macaulay describes in such favorable contrast with his low-minded sovereign, James, served a church as minister for many years, and must have been a man of real ability and much true culture. In fact, of necessity, it made a man more of a man and a scholar more of a scholar to gain and hold the views of Baptists, and defend them in private and public, in writing and in oral discussion, against the able and learned opponents whom he was compelled to encounter. And while the writings of these Baptists and their brethren evince much acuteness and sound scholarship, it should not detract from their claims to honor, that many of those which we now possess are statements or defences of their denominational views. Their situation made this their special department of labor. And while they did not publish many works like Jessey's *Description and Explanation of Jerusalem*, and that *English-Greek Lexicon of the N. T.*, which is one of the earliest in our language, and in which he had a large share, and Knollys' *Compendium of Latin, Greek and Hebrew Grammar*, and Du Veil's *Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, yet the larger part of their writings were not in defence of Baptist sentiments. In fact, some, like Spilsbury, Jessey, Lamb and Wilcox, published no work, so far as is now known, on the controversy concerning Baptism; and many a literary plan must have been abandoned in those troublous times, like Jessey's for the revision of our English version, after he had employed several years upon it. Constantly harassed, and always exposed to public persecution, as well as enduring private odium, these servants of Christ had little time or opportunity, except to defend themselves, or explain and support their sentiments by God's Word, and by philosophy, history, and logic. This they did well, and so rendered the cause of their Master no little service, and performed work of which all after them have enjoyed the beneficial results. And no one who has gone over the ground, can help

admiring them, and regretting that it is now out of our power to furnish as full and thorough a memorial as they deserve.

As in our own country and elsewhere, first cast out by their brethren for accepting and holding the simple teachings of Holy Scripture regarding Christ's church and ordinances, and thus compelled to assume the form of a distinct organization, they afterwards learned by experience what they were slow and loth to believe, that there was an incompatibility between their views and those of Pedobaptist churches which required them in faithfulness to the truth to assume for themselves amicably the position into which their brethren at first were in far more haste to thrust them than they to enter. Puritan, and especially Independent, churches were constantly producing them, as the natural fruit of the true principles on which they separated from a corrupt national church; and when they accepted the guidance of the Head of the Church, they found in the freedom, and strength, and gladness with which they could serve their Lord, not merely their own peace and growth in grace, but much to commend the truth as they held and followed it, to many other true servants of Christ who, as Hooker charged against some of their predecessors, judged, that "the Church should admit of no law-makers, but the Evangelists, no courts but presbyteries, no punishments but ecclesiastical censures."

M.

ARTICLE II.—MONTALEMBERT'S MONKS OF THE WEST.

[BY WM. GAMMELL, LL. D., PROFESSOR IN BROWN UNIVERSITY.]

The Monks of the West, from St. Benedict to St. Bernard. By the Count de Montalembert, member of the French Academy, Fide et Veritate. Authorized Translation. First two volumes. William Blackwood & Sons : Edinburgh and London. 1861.

THE name of the Count de Montalembert has long been distinguished alike in the politics and the literature of France. Born in 1810, he has been a witness of the great events, and to a large extent a participator in the changes, both social and ecclesiastical, that have taken place in the condition of his country. His mother was of a Scottish family, and at the time of his birth resided in London. His father adhered to the Bourbons in the Revolution that drove them from France, and after serving in a subordinate capacity in the British army, obtained an appointment, by virtue of his British marriage, on the staff of the Duke of Wellington. He did not return to France till after the fall of Napoleon and the restoration of the ancient monarchy. In 1819 he was raised to the French peerage, and died in 1831—less than a year after the “Revolution of July,” which placed Louis Phillippe on the throne. At that eventful period his son, the present Count de Montalembert, had already entered on the brilliant career, both as a scholar and a statesman, which he has ever since been pursuing. He had been carefully educated in the doctrines, both civil and ecclesiastical, to which the adherents of the Bourbons were so blindly attached under the reactionary influence of the Restoration. But he had learned to form his own opinions, and was already associated with other gifted

young men of the time, whose names, like his own, have since been distinguished — among the chief of whom was the Abbé Lacordaire. He became a disciple of Lamennais, then a leading champion of representative government and of church independence in France. With Lamennais and Lacordaire, he was engaged in conducting the newspaper *L'Avenir*, which was devoted to the views of which they were the advocates, and which being condemned by the Pope, was finally suppressed. In connection also with Lacordaire and De Caux, he founded a free Catholic school, which was arraigned as in violation of a law of Napoleon I., giving to the University of France the sole direction of public education. After a protracted trial, the school was at length adjudged illegal, and was suppressed by order of the House of Peers, to which he had now become responsible as the inheritor of his father's title. He had also published a work on the history of Sweden, to which he was indebted for the acquaintance and friendship of M. Guizot, the minister of Louis Phillippe, and the historian of modern civilization.

In 1835 — four years after his father's death — having attained the age of twenty-five years required by law, he took his seat in the Chamber of Peers, and was one of the most brilliant orators and debaters in that body, so long as it continued to exist. He ranked there with the Liberals, but on most political questions he supported the monarchy against the party of radicals and revolutionists by whom it was constantly assailed. He was an earnest defender of the Catholic faith, but in the controversies then beginning to appear between the Papal See and the Ultra-montanists, he zealously advocated the rights of the Gallic Church. He says of himself, at a later period of life, "my labors have been constantly guided by the firm resolve to serve the liberal cause, as separated from the cause of revolution, and the Catholic as separated from that of intolerance and despotism." "A free church in a free nation — this is the programme I began life with ; and after thirty years of study and contest, I still hold it to be the right one — just and rational and practical."

In his championship of free education — of the right of

every Frenchman to educate his children in his own religious faith, he was overthrown by the decision of the House of Peers in 1831. The attempt which he made with Lacordaire to establish free Catholic schools, was part of the long controversy — famous at that day — between the University and the Church, for the control of the whole system of public instruction in France. The University and the government were triumphant, and Montalembert, now more thoroughly devoted to the Church than ever before, began to mingle with his duties as a Peer of France, those historical studies of which he has given the world so many interesting fruits. In 1836, he published the *Life of Saint Elizabeth of Hungary*; in 1840, an essay entitled "*The influence of Christianity and Vandalism in the Arts*," and has written frequently for several literary journals on questions relating to the Church — always drawing his best illustrations from the studies he was pursuing in the great ages of ecclesiastical domination in Europe. In the French House of Peers, he was the most eloquent member, and though always true to the same grand ideals of Church and State which dwelt in his imagination, he was seldom for a long time the adherent of any particular party. During the latter part of the reign of Louis Phillippe, he was the acknowledged chief of the Catholic party in France, and at the same time he frequently stood forth as the advocate of freedom and oppressed nationality in Poland, and Italy, and Ireland. When the revolution of 1848 drew nigh, he acted with the party of reform, and vigorously opposed the ministry of M. Guizot, and on the overthrow of the monarchy and the abolition of the hereditary peerage to which he belonged, he sought an election and was chosen to the Constituent Assembly, and afterwards to the Chamber of Deputies of the new republic. But he was no republican, and soon grew weary of the revolution he had helped to promote. He always acted with the friends of order and of reactionary movements. He assisted in framing the bill for abolishing universal suffrage, and voted in favor of the law for restricting the freedom of the press. He was opposed to the elevation of Louis Napoleon to the presidency, but yet de-

fended him against the factious attempts of the deputies to destroy his rightful authority. He always cherished an invincible repugnance to imperialism, and sees in it nothing but the extinction of liberty, the degradation of religion, and the ruin of society. These results he finds chronicled in the history of the Roman Cæsars, and repeated even in the short-lived sway of Napoleon I., and is confident they will not fail to reappear in the restored empire of Napoleon III. He was therefore but little fitted to hold a seat in the present *Corps Legislatif* of France, and since 1857 he has lived in retirement, engaged in prosecuting those literary studies which had long been the solace and pastime of his life; and of which, among many others, the volumes now before us are the richest and ripest fruit.

The work of which they constitute the first installment, is designed to chronicle the origin and history, the struggles and trials of the Monks of the West; their services to the church, and their agency in civilization, down to the time of St. Bernard, their most illustrious representative and reformer, in the gloomiest century of the middle age. It is to be completed in six volumes, and singularly, though naturally enough, as he tells us in his preface, it is the extension of a much more limited design. After he had published that brilliant ecclesiastical legend, the *Life of Saint Elizabeth of Hungary*, "in whom," as he says, "was epitomized the Catholic poetry of suffering and of love, and whose modest and forgotten existence belonged nevertheless to the most resplendent epoch of the middle ages," he conceived the idea of celebrating the career of St. Bernard, as a great man and a great monk, and thus to vindicate the monastic profession, which he regards as the most misunderstood and most abused aspects of Catholic Christianity. But the studies which were thus made necessary carried him back to the days of Gregory the Great, the first pope who had come from the Monastic orders, and their great protector and master; and thence still further back, to St. Benedict their organizer and legislator, and from him, by a natural sequence of history, still further back, into the antiquities of the Christian ages, to the period when they were translated

to Europe from their cradle in the East. Having traced the thread of monastic history so far back, he of course could not forbear the sketch of those "Monastic Precursors of the East," who in the Thebais of Egypt and the mountains of Syria, first abandoned the world to dwell alone with God. These volumes are written with fervid eloquence, with a large acquaintance with the history of the early and mediæval Christian ages, and also with an unfaltering faith in the sanctity and the beneficence of the institution they are designed to celebrate. However obnoxious to literary criticism the process by which the author was led so largely to generalize his plan, no student of history will object to having in his hands so brilliant and learned an exposition of the most remarkable phase which ecclesiastical Christianity has ever presented.

The author sets forth the character and purpose of monastic life, with an enthusiasm which would have done credit to St. Ambrose, or St. Benedict himself. He describes it as "a condition of voluntary seclusion in order to secure salvation. The monk withdraws himself from other men, not in hatred or contempt of them, but for the love of God and his neighbor, and to serve them so much the better as he shall have more and more purified and regulated his soul." "He accepts, not only the precepts of the gospel, but its advice. To avoid what is forbidden, he renounces what is permitted. To reach goodness, he aspires to perfection. To make sure of his salvation, he would do more than is necessary to save him." This condition of life is as old as the world, and is ascribed by the author to two origins — a natural and a supernatural; the former being the tendency of human nature, and especially of all contemplative minds, to seek solitude and silence, and the latter being the divine command — which the author finds in two passages of the New Testament — the one containing the words of Jesus to the young man who had great possessions (Mark, x: 21), and the other, his reply to the Apostle Peter, who "began to say unto Him, Lo! we have left all and followed thee" (Mark, x: 29). From the former of these origins he derives the secluded lives of the philosophers and sages of all ages; the recluses of the Mahome-

tan and of nearly every pagan religion ; the prophets of Jewish antiquity, from Samuel to John the Baptist, as well as those companies of strange and stern ascetics like the Rechabites, the Therapeutists, and the Essenes, who appear so often in Old Testament history. But it is on the divine command alone that he plants the monasticism of the Christian Church, and to that, with the most simple-hearted faith, he traces the origin of those vast multitudes of monks, who, for so many ages, were the most conspicuous heralds and pioneers of Christianity throughout the world ; and who delighted to style themselves "the soldiers of Christ," "the Paladins of the Cross," and "the Chivalry of God."

We need not say that we have no faith in the adequacy of either, or of both these origins, taken by themselves, to account for the manifold varieties of solitary and ascetic life, which have been so prevalent alike in the pagan and Christian ages of the world. There is undoubtedly something in human nature to explain them, though we cannot find it in so simple a principle as that stated by M. Montalembert. Nor are we able to discover in either of the sayings of our Lord to which he refers, anything like a promise of spiritual reward to those who personally seclude themselves from the world. It is in conflict with the grand mission of Christianity, as the leaven that was to leaven the whole mass of mankind. The disciples of Jesus were designed to be the salt of the earth—candles burning on their candlesticks, and giving light to all around them ; and we can conceive of no more complete frustration of this divine design, than that which is secured by shutting them up in the cell of the anchorite, or the cloister of the cœnobite. But whatever be the motive, or combination of motives, which has produced the monastic life, there can be no doubt that this life has been greatly modified and ennobled by its connection with Christianity. Nowhere, save in Christendom, has it produced heroic characters or beneficent results. Everywhere else, in the modern world at least, it has been characterized by stupidity and laziness, by the most puerile superstitions and the most groundless pretensions to superior sanctity. And even in Christendom—alike in early and in later ages—

it has illustrated on the broadest scale the unfailing tendency of human nature to purchase, by self-denial, the favor of God, and to work out its own salvation by the imaginary accumulation of superabundant merits. "The monk," says M. Montalembert, "to make sure of his salvation, would do more than is necessary to save him." (!!) On this narrow and most unscriptural basis does the whole fabric of Christian monasticism rest. Many a great and heroic spirit, it is true, has burst the shackles of monastic selfishness, and wrought the noblest deeds for the benefit of his fellow men ; but it would not be difficult to show, that throughout the vulgar herd of the monks of all ages, there has prevailed the ruinous idea of securing the kingdom of heaven by superior holiness and accumulated merits.

Very early in Christian history, the ascetic tendency began to develop itself in the church — especially in the East. Solitary life in deserts and caves often became a necessity to the Christian disciple, in consequence of the persecutions to which he was everywhere subjected. It was also promoted by the condition of the world around him. He found himself in the midst of pagans and barbarians ; every where in contact with a society essentially heathen ; with manners licentious and depraved ; with a government hostile and despotic, and a mode of thought wholly at variance with the spiritual ideas and the faith which he cherished. Amidst influences like these, the monastic life had already drawn to its retreats in the East multitudes of Christians, even before the peace secured to the church by the so-called conversion of Constantine. The secluded places of the upper and the lower Thebais, and the mountain fastnesses of Syria and Palestine, were peopled with recluses whom either persecution or disgust had driven from their homes, to seek in solitude the peace which the world could not give. Here Christian asceticism developed itself into monastic life, and anchorets and hermits, smitten with love for seclusion, dwelt each by himself in the desert places in which they had respectively taken refuge. At this period appeared those famous "Monastic Precursors of the East," Anthony, Paul, Pacomius, the two Ammons, the

two Macarii, and the others whom our author delights to celebrate as the morning stars of Christian Monasticism. Under their auspices, especially those of Anthony and Pacomius, the life of these religious recluses took on another phase, and was organized into something like a common system, and the solitary anchorets were formed into societies, dwelling no longer in separated cells, but in spacious cloisters, bearing the name of Cœnobites. "Nothing in the wonderful history of these hermits of Egypt is so incredible as their number. But the most weighty authorities are agreed in establishing it. It was a kind of emigration of hives to the desert; of civilization to simplicity; of noise to silence; of corruption to innocence. The current once began, floods of men, of women, and of children, threw themselves into it, and flowed thither during a century with irresistible force. Let us quote some figures: Pacome, who died at fifty-six, reckoned three thousand monks under his rule; his monasteries at Tabenne soon included seven thousand, and St. Jerome affirms that as many as fifty thousand were present at the annual gathering of the general congregation of monasteries which followed his rule." It was said that there were as many monks in the Egyptian deserts as inhabitants in the Egyptian towns. Nor were their monasteries unknown in the towns, for a traveller in A. D. 356, found in the single town of Oxyrynchus, on the Nile, ten thousand monks and twenty thousand nuns. In this vast horde of oriental monks, the anchoret and the cœnobite principles struggled with each other, though the latter constantly gained upon the former, and finally triumphed by the general adoption of the rule put forth by St. Basil.

The introduction of monachism into Europe is to be ascribed to the agency of Athanasius, during his banishment at Rome, about the year 340, by the Arian Emperor of the East. He had long been connected with the great Cœnobite societies which were flourishing in Egypt, and assisted by two monks who accompanied him to Italy, he immediately began to establish them in the place of his exile. A zeal for the new religious life thus commended to their adoption soon spread among the people of Rome, and the city and its environs ere

long had a monastery in every secluded spot they contained. After the death of St. Anthony, about the year 356, Athanasius wrote his life, and the story of his wonderful works as the abbot of many monasteries, disarmed all opposition and fascinated the imaginations of the Italian people. The institution spread in Italy and Southern Gaul, almost as rapidly as in Egypt and the East. The Roman nobility gave it their patronage and favor. Senators and consuls changed their costly rural villas into religious houses, and in many a circle of rank and fashion, there might constantly be seen the coarse gray mantle of the monk overlying the purple robe that told of patrician descent and patrician power. Roman matrons, too, bearing names that were famous in the best days of the republic — proud daughters of the Marcelli and the Scipios, the Fabii and the Camilli — embraced the monastic life, and thus in the declining age of Rome, reproduced in all their glory the ancient virtues of many an illustrious race. It was not merely a reproduction of the indolent and dreamy seclusion which had first developed itself among the caves of Egypt, but from the beginning it was an embodiment of the social principle, and men and women converted themselves into monks and nuns, in order that they might aid each other in the attainment of piety and the acquisition of religious knowledge. The genius of the West, too, naturally demanded a system different from that which had sprung up in the East, and though the essential character was everywhere the same, the monasteries which arose in Italy and Gaul bore upon their organization the impress of the theological and social ideas that ruled the West.

The rapid extension of monachism in Europe during the middle of the fifth century, is still further to be accounted for by the wretched condition of society. The empire of the West had nearly run its course, and was hastening to its ruin. The barbarians were already within its limits, and had quartered themselves in its capital. The See of St. Peter, then occupied by feeble pontiffs, had been stript of much of the power and importance it possessed in the days of Innocent I., and Leo the Great. Imperialism, as the author styles it in the hatred he feels for all

military monarchy, had done its unfailing work, and had filled the world with servility, corruption, and despair of the future. Paganism and Arianism—the religions of the new masters of the Empire—were beginning to prevail even in regions hitherto most faithful to the creed of Athanasius and Augustine. “In all the ancient Roman world, there did not exist a prince who was not either a Pagan, an Arian, or a Eutychian.” Not one of the new states founded by the barbarians on the spots they had conquered, now belonged to the Catholic faith. The civil state had fallen into hopeless decay, and the church seemed to be appointed to the same melancholy destiny. In this fearful anarchy alike of political and ecclesiastical society, it was natural that the noblest minds of the age should seek an asylum for their faith, and a sphere for their enterprise in the new religious life whose institutions were springing up around them. Jerome and Ambrose, the illustrious fathers of Latin Christianity, became its champions, and advocates, and Augustine, their still more illustrious successor in the Latin Church, tells us in his “*Confessions*” that it was at Milan, while reading by turns the Life of St. Anthony and the Epistles of St. Paul, “the light of assurance spread over his soul, and the darkness of doubt disappeared.” Henceforth, though he did not become a monk, he at least led a monastic life, and to all the great labors which he so nobly wrought for Christianity, we may also add his signal services as a legislator and reformer of the monasteries of the West. Thus it was that the monasteries gathered to them the best social elements of the world. They were no longer homes for mere contemplative recluses; they became aggressive societies, full of active energy and zeal, and sent forth missionaries to conquer back for the church the realms which Arians and Pagans were wresting from her dominions. It was not till the beginning of the eighth century, that the monks were generally regarded as members of the priestly order, though they early began to aspire to clerical authority and privileges. They often preached and everywhere stood forth among the most energetic and determined defenders and propagators of the Catholic faith. The long impending doom of the Western Empire

was at length accomplished. The barbarians spread themselves over southern Europe, and civilization became extinct, but not till the monks of the West had built their countless monasteries on all the frontiers as well as in all the central places of Christendom, and had gathered within them the books of the Old and New Testaments, the lore of ancient philosophy and the creations of classic genius, all that was most worth preserving from the wreck of the elder world.

Such was the commanding position to which the monastic institution had worked its way at the close of the fifth century, the period at which the barbarians took possession of the South of Europe. It had become a power in the church which neither bishop nor pope nor council could disregard. As such it was to take possession of the future, and in no slight degree to shape the fortunes of that ecclesiastical dominion, which was about to be established in Christendom. With a far wider and higher reach of its influence, it was also to achieve a most important part of the grand agency which the church was to have in forming the new civilization of Europe. "Its part in human affairs was only beginning. For a thousand years longer none of the great names of the church shall be strangers to it ; for a thousand years it shall inscribe its name at the head of all the great pages of history." But the monasteries, powerful as they had become, were thus far but imperfectly organized. They were destitute of any common system of discipline or service, and in the anarchy and confusion which had spread over general society, it is not surprising that these spiritual societies early began to yield to the disorders and vices incident to human frailty, whether in the cloister or the market place. These disorders were already enfeebling their strength, and alienating many of their most powerful friends, and had they not been vigorously checked, the monks of the West would soon have fallen from their high estate, victims of the same premature decay which had overtaken their brethren in the East.

It was precisely at this moment, when a great organizer and lawgiver was most signally needed, that Benedict of Nursia appeared, and by the force of superior genius and exalted

character, infused order and unity into these scattered and independent societies of Cœnobites. At the age of twelve years he was sent to Rome for his education, and was there when the city was still the prize for contending tribes of barbarians, when Herulians and Ostrogoths each in turn had possession of the Capitol and the tomb of St. Peter. He fled in disgust from the place now profaned by the revelry of successive conquests, and spent the years of his opening manhood as a hermit in a cave at Monte Subiaco, in the Campagna di Roma. In the mountain region around Subiaco he passed thirty-five years, distinguished for the charm of his eloquence and the piety of his life, and founding twelve monasteries which he ruled as abbott. In 529 he went to the ancient town of Casinum, and there amid scenes of surpassing beauty, famous forever in classic as in Christian story, he founded the abbey of Monte Cassino, destined soon to become the most celebrated and powerful in Catholic Christendom, and the model by which every other was to be framed. Here, in the meridian of his busy and studious life, he wrote and enforced in practice, the famous *Sancta Regula*, which soon was adopted as the law of nearly every monastic community of the West, and which has long been regarded as the most remarkable monument of legislative genius which the age produced. We need not stop to analyze this Rule which has immortalized the name of Benedict, for even though its seventy-three chapters are now seldom read, they have been frequently described by writers who have narrated his wonderful life, and by no one with more fervid admiration than by M. Montalembert. We can quote only the passage which sets forth the magnificent results. After a brief inquiry as to how much was really designed to be accomplished by the author of the *Sancta Regula*, he proceeds :

“However it might be, the results of Benedict’s Works were immense. In his lifetime, as after his death, the sons of the noblest races in Italy and the best of the converted barbarians came in multitudes to Monte Cassino. They came out again, and descended from it to spread themselves over all the West ; missionaries and husbandmen, who were soon to become the doctors and pontiffs, the artists and legislators, the historians and poets of the new world. They went forth to spread peace and faith, light and life, freedom and charity, knowledge and art, the word of God and the genius of man, the Holy Scriptures

and the great works of classical literature, amid the despairing provinces of the destroyed Empire, and even into the barbarous regions from which the destruction came forth. Less than a century after the death of Benedict, all that barbarism had won from civilization was reconquered; and more still, his children took in hand to carry the Gospel beyond those limits which had confined the first disciples of Christ. After Italy, Gaul and Spain had been retaken from the enemy, Great Britain, Germany and Scandinavia were in turn invaded, conquered and incorporated into Christendom. The West was saved. A new empire was founded—a new world began."

"Come now," he continues in his strain of prophetic history, "O, Barbarians! the Church no longer fears you. Reign where you will! Civilization shall escape your hands; or rather, it is you who shall defend the Church and confirm civilization. You have vanquished everything, conquered everything, overthrown everything; you shall now be in your turn vanquished, conquered, and transformed. Men are born who shall become your masters. They shall take your sons, and even the sons of your kings to enroll them in their army. They shall take your daughters, your queens, your princesses, to fill their monasteries. They shall take your souls to inspire them; your imaginations to delight and pacify them; your courage to temper it by sacrifice; your swords to consecrate them to the service of faith, weakness and justice."

"The work will be neither short nor easy; but they will accomplish it. They will govern the new nations by showing them the ideal of sanctity, of moral force and greatness. They will make them the instruments of goodness and truth. Aided by these victors of Rome, they will carry the sway and laws of a new Rome beyond the furthest limits ever fixed by the Senate or dreamt of by the Cæsars. They will conquer and bless lands which neither the Roman eagles nor even the Apostles have reached. They will become the nursing fathers of all modern nations. They will be seen beside the thrones of Charlemagne, of Alfred and of Otto the Great, forming with their Christian kingdoms, a new world. Finally, they will ascend the Apostolic See with St. Gregory the Great and St. Gregory VII., from which they will preside during ages of conflict and virtue, over the destinies of Catholic Europe, and of the Church, gloriously assisted by races faithful, manful and free." (Vol. II., pages 66-7-8.)

The *Sancta Regula* was the great agency by which the monks of the West were converted from a vast collection of cœnobite societies into a comprehensive monastic Order, all whose members were affiliated together by the bonds of a common discipline, and a common life. Its fundamental principles were Labor and Obedience, and it divided the hours of the day and the night, save what were required for sleep, between agricultural work and religious duties. Its rapid and universal adoption by the monastic communities proves how much such a rule was needed, and how wisely it was adapted

to wants which were universally felt. It would, however, be erroneous to imagine that it was everywhere received without opposition. It was strongly resisted in many a monastery, especially in those whose members clung to the loose freedom and revelled in the wild disorders it was designed to repress. It was, however, advocated by most of the abbots as well as by the bishops and secular clergy, who had already begun to regard with jealousy and apprehension, the independence and power of the monastic communities. Nor was the authority of the Papal See long wanting in promoting its universal establishment throughout the West. In 590, less than fifty years after the death of Benedict, Gregory the Great, yielding to the unanimous and repeated choice of the "Senate, the people and the clergy," laid aside the cowl of the monk, and assumed the tiara of the Pope. The chair of St. Peter was now for the first time filled by a monk. Born of a noble Roman ancestry, he had already attained to such honors as, in the vassalage and decay of Rome, were within the reach of its patrician youth. He had been Prætor of the city when the Lombards attacked its walls, and in helpless terror and dismay, had seen these bearded barbarians plunder its churches and desolate its monasteries. Monte Cassino was pillaged and burnt, and the monks fleeing to Rome for protection, were hospitably received by its Prætor, who learned of these disciples and successors of Benedict, the superior glory and honor of the monastic life. He soon yielded to its fascinations, and selling his vast patrimonial possessions, he founded six monasteries in Sicily, and converted his own palace on the Cœlian Hill into a seventh, which he dedicated to St. Andrew, and in which he became a monk, and was afterwards chosen abbot. It was from the seclusion of this monastery on the Cœlian Hill, of which he had been for years the head, that on the death of Pelagius II., he was summoned by an admiring people to the papal chair.

The influence of Gregory, now the Supreme Pontiff of the church, was immediately seen in the advancement of the Order to which he was enthusiastically attached. He never ceased to be a monk, and the whole course of his administra-

tion bears the marks of his monastic life and education. The *Sancta Regula* of Benedict, embodied his idea of the life a monk should lead, and he exerted his Pontifical authority for its universal adoption. At the Council of Rome in 595, he gave it his solemn sanction, and in all the monasteries which were founded by his authority, he caused it to be established. Monte Cassino, was still in ruins, and its monks, driven away by the sword of the Lombards, were dwelling in a new monastery which they had built at Rome, near the Vatican Palace of the Popes. But to the islands of the Adriatic and the Mediterranean, where the Benedictines had reared their homes, and especially to Lerins—"the happy isle" of St. Honoratus—now the monastic metropolis of Gaul, and to Condat among the peaks of the Jura mountains, Gregory constantly extended his protection and his patronage. His Pontificate did not close till he had seen the monks of nearly all western Christendom, not only submitting themselves to the precepts of the *Sancta Regula*, but also exempt from the assaults of the barbarians and secure in the rights and immunities of their Order.

The Benedictine Rule, however, at a somewhat later period found a formidable rival in the sterner and more ascetic discipline of Columbanus, the monastic missionary of Ireland, who carried to Gaul and Italy, the Celtic Christianity of his native island. He planted a monastery and school at Luxeuil in Sequania, and another at Bobbio in Lombardy. At each of these famous seats of monastic life and learning, he set in operation the Rule which he had devised. It was shorter and simpler, as well as more severe than that of Benedict. It was enthusiastically embraced by a multitude of eager disciples, especially in Gaul, who, during a portion of the seventh century, were more numerous than the followers of Benedict, and secured for their favorite sanctuary at Luxeuil a literary and religious renown surpassing that of Lerins or Monte Cassino. "By their means" says M. Montalembert, "the genius and memory of Columbanus hover over the whole of the seventh century, of all the centuries the most fertile and illustrious in the fervor of the monastic establishments which it produced. However, we shall see before the century was completed, the Rule and

Institution of the great Irishman everywhere replaced by the spirit and laws of his immortal predecessor. Columbanus had more of that fascination which attracts for a day or for a generation, than of that depth of genius which creates for ages." (Vol. II., p. 451.) The broad statesmanship of the Italian law-giver triumphed at last, and the monasteries of the West, even though founded by the disciples of Columbanus, submitted to the Rule, and were called by the name of Benedict. The cause of the universal prevalence of this Rule the author finds in part, in its moderation, its prudence and the more liberal spirit of its government; but still more in its more intimate union with the authority of the Roman See—a union begun by Gregory the Great and cemented by his successors and by the councils which they held.

With this triumph of the Benedictine Rule in the monasteries of Italy and France, and its very general prevalence in Spain, in Germany and Britain, the author brings to a close the present portion of his history of the Monks of the West. Their uniformity was now established, and the decisive step had been taken in creating those intimate relations with the Papacy from which either party was afterwards to derive so much strength. The position thus far secured for the monasteries made them conspicuous among the institutions of Latin Christianity, and prepared them for the important part they were to perform in the formation and progress of modern civilization. Though the monks were not yet reckoned among the clergy, nearly all the great missionary movements of the seventh century were entrusted to their agency. Gregory the Great, while yet a monk, had set out on a mission of teaching Christianity to the Saxons of Britain, some of whose young men he had seen exposed for sale in the slave markets of Rome; and when brought back to the papal city, and himself chosen to be Pope, it was he who sent Augustine and his forty fellow monks to accomplish that noble and heroic work. Columbanus and St. Gall, Wilfred and Boniface, were all monks, as well as most of their coadjutors who planted the earliest outposts of the Christian faith among those fierce Teutonic races that were soon to become the masters of mankind.

Christianity in the West thus everywhere assumed the monastic type, and henceforth for several centuries it was to be heralded and established in every pagan land by its monastic professors and preachers. Indeed, it has usually been held that any other form of Christianity would have failed to impress the stern, rough minds of these barbarians of the North. Certain it is, that while they were reckless of every other monument of humanity or of religion, they were awed by the spectacle of these cloistered companies of pious devotees, and while they burned the churches and laid waste the cities of Christendom, they generally spared the holy houses consecrated to devotion and praise. Even in this early century, they were standing amid the most beautiful landscapes of Western Europe. In the forest fastness and on the mountain side, by the silver fountain and in the wooded dell, these sanctuaries everywhere arose to spread culture over the waste places of the earth, and knowledge and religion among their barbarous populations.

It was not, as we have already intimated, till near the middle of the eighth century, that the monks were generally reckoned among the clergy, nor were the monasteries subject to the episcopal jurisdiction of the bishops. There had been discernible, however, from a very early period, a growing tendency towards each of these results. The monks had never been satisfied with their humble ecclesiastical position among the laity, and some of their number had always been priests. It soon became a common aspiration among them, to hold a higher rank, and without ceasing to be monks, to share the privileges, authority and hopes of promotion which belonged to the clerical order. This aspiration was encouraged at the very beginning by Athanasius, who, as bishop of Alexandria, gave ordination to many monks of the East. It was also indulged to a considerable extent, by Ambrose the bishop of Milan, and still more by the illustrious monastic pope, Gregory the Great. In this manner the monastic and the clerical orders had always been in some degree intermingled, and there were probably few monasteries that did not number priests among their inmates. That they should be thus provided with those

qualified to discharge the offices of the church, was in strict accordance with the Rule of St. Benedict, and for this purpose priests had often been admitted members of the monastic societies. The bishops, however, and the other high ecclesiastical authorities, did not generally favor the indiscriminate ordination of monks, and were accustomed to ascribe their aspiration for such preferment to worldly ambition, or, as Cassienus styled it, "the demon of vain glory." But an aspiration so natural was not to be repressed. The monks were constantly becoming a greater power in the church. They were regarded as superior in sanctity to the clergy, and the life they led was acknowledged to be the purest exemplification of Christian self-denial and consecration. The opposition to their ordination gradually yielded, and had generally ceased before the close of the seventh century, though it was not till the century following that they were universally recognized as clergy, and the distinction was established between regular clergy, or those under the monastic Rule, and secular clergy, or those in charge of parishes.

The monks carried the day, but their triumph was to be productive of results which they did not anticipate. The monasteries, though everywhere respectfully acknowledging the spiritual jurisdiction of the bishops, had always claimed to be self-governing societies, subject only to the final authority of the Papal See. The question was as old as the beginning of the monastic life, and the controversy to which it gave rise had been even more angry than that relating to ordination. Soldiers of Christ and Paladins of the Church, as they everywhere styled themselves, the monks scorned the restrictions of a diocese, and refused to recognize the temporal sway of the local episcopacy. In vain had councils decreed their subordination. In vain had kings seconded the episcopal authority in its attempts to gain the ascendancy over them. They appealed to the Pope, with whom their relations were always intimate, and by temporizing and evasion, by alternate yielding and resistance, they long maintained the virtual independence which they claimed. The charters which they thus obtained, sometimes went beyond the mere immunity

from episcopal control, and made them the guardians and governors even of churches and their services. A papal charter conferring a jurisdiction like this, granted to the abbey of *Classe* at Ravenna, by Gregory the Great, produced an angry controversy between the archbishop of that city and the pontiff at Rome.

But with the general entrance of the monks into priestly ordination, their ability to withstand these episcopal encroachments became seriously impaired. They were no longer merely members of religious houses, or societies of cloistered Cœnobites, living under a Rule of their own adoption, but they were also presbyters of the church, ordained by episcopal hands and subject to episcopal authority. Their independence was thus virtually lost, though they struggled long to recover it. They still maintained their contest with the bishops, though no longer on equal terms. As it went on they were often glad to agree upon truces with their opponents, and to accept from them episcopal charters greatly abridging the ancient liberties for which they had so long contended. They sometimes openly resisted the bishop, and in here and there an instance, repelled his visitations by force of arms. The bishops in turn excommunicated the monks and placed their monastery under an interdict, thus often stripping them of their possessions, and drying up the very sources of their life. They were in this manner compelled to submit, and to accept whatever terms the episcopal authority might impose. In other instances, the bishop got himself elected abbot of the monastery, and was thus enabled to wield over it the double sceptre of episcopal and monastic authority. Nowhere else in literature, so far as we know, has this struggle been so instructively sketched, or its results so philosophically traced, as in the lectures of M. Guizot on the history of civilization in France; for it was in France that the triumph of episcopal power became most complete, and its consequences, both ecclesiastical and social, most conspicuous and important. Still even there the monasteries, as the oppressed and feebler party, long continued to be the depositories and champions of freedom, against the despotism of the local diocesans, and to

draw to their asylums all who were victims of priestly oppression. It is in this phase of their chequered fortunes, as the distinguished writer above referred to has so well pointed out, that they stand forth in striking analogy with the towns of mediæval Europe, clinging to their ancient municipal freedom, and struggling for their enfranchisement from the feudal barons.

But whatever notice M. Montalembert may design to take of struggles like these, he has reserved for the future volumes of his brilliant and attractive work. We cannot doubt that he will make use of the opportunity they will present, to celebrate in some of his most glowing chapters the services to freedom and humanity thus performed by these peerless saints and heroes of his fondest admiration. Indeed he has already given us an intimation of the claims he will set up for them, in his Introduction, which fills half of the first volume. One of its chapters is devoted to the "services rendered to Christendom by the monks." His views are undoubtedly exaggerated, and his aim is wholly impracticable, for it is nothing less than to prove their present and permanent importance to the interests of Christianity and the church. An aim like this can never be fulfilled. The monks have long been declining in Christendom, and they can never again rise to their early importance. Not only have they been condemned with united voice, and utterly rejected in every Protestant land, but they exist only with diminished favor and respect in many countries still professing the Roman faith. Throughout the Catholic nations of northern Europe, among whose barbarian ancestors they were the first to bear the doctrines of the cross, they have now nearly disappeared. In Portugal and Spain, where the middle ages still linger scarcely changed by the lapse of time, the monasteries have been given over to confiscation. In France, for so long a period their favorite and most flourishing home, where so many spots are consecrated by the great names of monastic history, they are constantly yielding to the inroads either of legal spoliation or of moral decay. The author informs us, that "it has been calculated that in five years — between 1830 and 1835 — three thousand

monasteries have disappeared from the soil of Europe." He mourns with eloquent and touching grief over the profanations and mutilations to which many still standing have been subjected. "There," says he, "it is a stable, there a theatre; in another case, a barrack or a jail, which we find installed in all that remains of the most renowned abbeys." In a few instances, as at Cluny and Le Bec, they have been transformed into stables; in others into schools, and in many more into places of industrial art and manufacture, "designed to propagate the worship of gain, and with it, the degradation of the soul." Even since these statistics of their number were gathered by M. Montalembert, the work of destruction of which he so indignantly complains, has still gone on. A few years ago the monasteries in Piedmont were suppressed by act of Parliament, and as we write these pages the tidings reach us that the king of Sardinia — soon we hope to be the ruler of united Italy — is proceeding by a more summary process, to take possession of those in his newly acquired provinces.

The motives which have led to this wholesale destruction or alienation of the monasteries of Europe, may not always have been honorable and pure. It may often have had its origin in policy or in selfishness; in the hate of the infidel for religion, or the cupidity of the monarch for wealth. The transaction, we admit, will not always — perhaps not often — bear examining; nor is the manner in which it has been brought about, in all cases, such as history can defend. Beautiful architecture has been ruined; tombs of saints and sages have been desecrated; property piously devoted in other generations to the service of religion, and to what at least was believed to be the glory of God and the good of man, has been alienated to satiate avarice, or to pamper servility; and hundreds and thousands of monks and nuns who had committed no crime, and been condemned by no law, have been driven from their homes the victims of political power or of popular prejudice, and turned penniless and thriftless upon a world they could not live in. Let us not attempt to justify the method of Henry VIII., or that of the French Assembly. Rights may have been violated, sacred associations and hallowed memories out-

raged ; vindictive passions may have been gratified, and the hearts of men made colder and harder by the proceeding. But, notwithstanding all this, the destruction or secularization of the monasteries so widely, in Catholic as well as Protestant Christendom, by whatever means accomplished, shows full well that they have lost their hold on the mind of the modern world. They who take the lead in depreciating them, may or may not deserve the names which M. Montalembert applies to them—of Vandals, tradesmen, and economists—but the fact is indisputable that their day is irrevocably gone. They still exist, it is true, in large numbers in several countries both of Europe and America, and if the ecclesiastical year-books are to be believed, more monasteries have been founded since the beginning of the nineteenth century, than in any other half century of Christian history. The monks of Christendom are said to number at least one hundred thousand, and the nuns are reported to be still more numerous. But they no longer, as of old, control the fortunes either of church or of state. They are no longer, like their great Benedictine predecessors, the masters of literature, of theology, and of education. They exist only by a precarious sufferance, for they are daily coming to be regarded more and more widely, as a vast horde of non-producing idlers, who, in the midst of a busy age, are receiving enormous stipends without labor, and consuming the fruits of others' industry, without any service of adequate compensation.

Still, it must be admitted, they have had a splendid past, and the student of history is at a loss to perceive how Christianity and civilization could have done without them. They tracked the earth's surface over every continent and through every zone in proclaiming the gospel to men, and in ways which cannot be numbered, they were the pioneers of knowledge and of all the arts of civilization, to each of the leading races of the world. M. Montalembert, with all his love of truth and his zeal for its investigation, has too often blended legend with history and given us in his narrative, a monkish fable for an actual fact. But there is, after all, a substantial basis of truth, for what he tells us of the services which these Monks of the West have rendered to the modern

world. They built their monasteries in the most fertile and attractive spots in Europe. Around them they gathered the rude population of the country, and made the desert and solitary place blossom with agriculture, and thrive with trade. They founded cities that became the homes of popular freedom; they wrote history, supported education and preserved from the barbarians the remains of literature and art. They gave asylum to the oppressed and emancipation to slaves, and through long ages, they furnished the only caravanseries for travellers, and the only hospitals for the sick. They transcribed the Scriptures of the Old and the New Testaments — they reproduced the writings of the Fathers of the Church — they debated the great questions of theology and of ethics, and they proudly claim a long succession of the most illustrious names that have appeared in the history of Latin Christianity — from Athanasius even down to the Abbè Lacordaire, the champion of the Dominican Order, and the most eloquent preacher of France, whose recent death has touched the sympathies of many a Christian heart on either side of the Atlantic. Their chief condemnation consists in the fact that they have survived all the ages to whose wants they could minister; that they have long outlived all the usefulness they ever had. They are now only yielding to that unvarying law of human affairs which dooms to decline and decay every institution, however venerable, that has ceased to promote the interests, or to ennoble the life of society.

ARTICLE III.—STEUDEL ON THE INSPIRATION OF THE
APOSTLES.—[CONCLUDED.]

[TRANSLATED BY REV. A. HOVEY, D. D., PROFESSOR IN NEWTON THEOLOG-
ICAL INSTITUTION.]

IF it is now urged that the theory of Elwart admits that there is no genuine Christian truth outside of the Bible, inasmuch as the term truth is restricted to the ground-doctrine, we will proceed to examine the question: *Whether even the fundamental doctrines of Christianity would be secured as truth, by the theory of Elwart? Whether the determination of the object of faith would not be altogether uncertain?*

According to his theory, we must assume that the Apostles were living in an atmosphere of erroneous, sin-distorted opinions, into which the doctrine received from Christ must enter and be itself obscured and wrongly apprehended. This unfavorable circumstance was not at all, or but partially, remedied by the influence of the Spirit; for he only aimed to secure a vital appropriation of the chief fact of Christianity, but left untouched by his correcting influence, those conceptions which were remote from the central fact, how important soever a part they might play in completing the representation of Christian truth. Hence we should have to adopt the rule: "That the nearer a proposition is to the great truth of redemption, the more certainly may it be known as Christian doctrine; while the farther it lies from that truth, the more possible is it that it belongs to the *form* of doctrine, to the individual shaping of the idea."

It seems to me that great objections to such a criterion present themselves from several quarters—and, first of all, the

objection that there is no exegetical foundation whatever for such a rule. If I allow myself, on subjective grounds, to limit the promise given by Christ, I have nothing conclusive to urge against him who rejects such a promise as wholly unreliable, and who does this on the ground of his inability to conceive of any action of the Divine Spirit which gives to man a certain knowledge of truth, or, in general, to conceive of the Spirit's action at all, except as an impulse in man to be ascribed to the Divine causality, no otherwise than as every thing which takes place is to be referred to that causality. Nay, he will claim to be more logical than I, because he does not arbitrarily limit the range or contents of that promise, but simply assigns to the expression a meaning which he is able to sustain by passages enough ; urging especially, with irresistible force, as against the theory of Elwart, that the whole description of the Spirit of God in the Gospel of John is borrowed from Jewish forms of speech, and hence belongs to a circle of representations foreign to the new light of Christian truth. If, by making the *Spirit* everything, we relinquish the right to determine the meaning of the *Word* in a grammatico-historical way, how can we show that this Spirit of truth reveals the essential nature of Christianity, and gives a certain knowledge of this, and does not rather point to an ability, *gradually* developing itself in the Apostles to know the truth ; so that the very *substance* of religious truth, as delivered by the Apostles, was unreliable and in need of correction !

But if it be granted that there was an operation of the Holy Spirit which shed infallible light on the essential nature of Christianity, how can we succeed in ascertaining this essential nature ? For, in the first place, we come under the influence of Christianity, and examine its contents with a sinful disposition. Will not this so pervert our apprehension of it that the essential nature of Christianity, though handed down to us in the writings of the Apostles, will yet escape us ? And precisely because the Word does not bind us, but the Spirit, while the sinful soul in us has no affinity for what is purest in Christianity, but attaches itself eagerly to that which was made impure by the remaining sinfulness of the Apostles.

Hence if we suppose the product of the Spirit to have come down from the age of the Apostles to our own, with additions from sinful sources, little will remain of the purity of the original light; and still less, if we add, in agreement with the theory which we are now examining, that the Christian spirit to be appropriated can be derived from the Church only.

Now, God be praised! the lot of Christian truth is not so sad as this; though we cannot believe it would have been better had not the power of the *incorruptible word* asserted itself from the first in opposition to the sinful disposition of man. This it has done by virtue of the fact that there have always been souls who have confided in the Spirit as being *truly* represented in the word, and have restrained the sinful bias of their own nature by their firm adhesion to the truth of the word; yet without being liable to the reproach of a slavery to the letter which unfitted them to apprehend the spirit and life of Christianity. But a glance at the course of our recent theology will afford undeniable proof that a rejection of the binding authority of the word leads to the most dissimilar views of the essential nature of Christianity. The school from which proceeds that theory of inspiration now called in question by us, has indeed aided in bringing again into repute the idea of redemption as the foundation of Christian truth. But opposed to this — although more akin to it in principle than a superficial glance leads one to think — is there not another leading school, which refers the entire conception of a redemption through Christ to the bare form of Christianity, and maintains that adhesion to it is incompatible with a true apprehension of the moral spirit of this religion? And if we look more closely at the word *redemption*, as used by the former school, is not this taken in a sense which other students of the Sacred Word have been compelled to regard as entirely wrong and at war with the true meaning of that word? Is not the sum of Christian doctrine overthrown, when, in respect to those essential attributes of God which have always been deemed most vital and powerful in forming the Christian life, and concerning which but one voice has been heard down through the whole course of the develop-

ment of Christian truth, a representation is smuggled in, which is the *grave* of all truth hitherto conditioning the Christian life?

If experience affords such decisive evidence that in an attempt to apprehend the *spirit* of Christianity without a strict regard to the word, this spirit, according to the peculiar dispositions of those who profess to have discovered it, is a self-contradictory one — a circumstance which might have been foreseen at the outset — what method presents itself for deciding the question: Which now is the true spirit of Christianity, this or its opposite? We really do not perceive how any method can be devised to ascertain what is to be recognized as actually true, unless the words of Scripture are authoritative. Whoever wishes to understand the spirit of Christianity in a given way, will naturally refer whatever does not agree with his idea of it to that part of doctrine which is unreliable, because remote from the centre of Christianity. And if the frequent repetition of a doctrine is thought to be a reason for assigning it to the ground of faith, some will choose this and others that book of the New Testament, for the sake of finding what agrees with their tastes, and will affirm of these books, that the recurrence of an unpalatable doctrine in them is due to some idiosyncrasy of the writers, or their efforts to accommodate themselves to particular readers. In this way, many pretend that the whole doctrine of the atonement by the death of Christ, as unfolded in the letters of Paul, is a perversion of simple Christianity, and others that John's Gospel gives a representation of Christ's dignity different from the original and true representation, which was sacrificed by him to a theory. A discovery of truth, even in its fundamental principles, will only then be effected when its natural force is given to every word of Scripture, and when no expression of truth is held to be drawn from the original source which does not weigh every statement of the New Testament pertaining to that truth, and aim to unite and harmonize the whole testimony. Otherwise every man will select that which appears to express what he himself desires to find, and will pass by the rest; and while the many-sided exhibition of

the Christian system given in the New Testament, opposes an effectual barrier to a narrow and partial view of it, this barrier is thrown down by the arbitrary will of Him who professes to appropriate the spirit of Christianity, by separating the essential from the non-essential in the word. As beings who are involved in sin, we are in danger of cutting ourselves off, by such a process, from the influence of just those truths of Christianity by which it is fitted to produce the sorrows of repentance, and thus cleanse our hearts from sin. Moreover, by subordinating the letter of Scripture to our own will, we not only surrender the essential principles of Christianity to the caprice of every other mind, but we also make them dependent upon every change in our own mood and bias. From of old, it has been a matter of uniform experience, that faith is now great and strong, full of confidence and joy, and now small and weak, mixed with doubt and despondency. Were only that which is deducible from the life to be acknowledged by the Christian as true and genuine, to what fluctuations, uncertainties, mutilations, curtailments, and additions, would the treasure of truth be exposed? Is not then the *word* given, in order that by resorting to it our faith may be confirmed and rectified? Must there not be in it a power which goes forth to impart life, rather than one which is put into it by the life? If the latter were true, it would be a poor word for us when we were more in need of its fulness.

Yet, assuming that the Bible has in itself the treasure of infallible truth, and hence that some portion of that truth is to be found in every sentence, it may still be objected that the greatest differences of interpretation have prevailed, and therefore it cannot be rash, in striving to ascertain the spirit of Christianity, to leave out of sight many passages as not really belonging to it. But this objection can hardly be entertained without doing serious injury to earnest and conscientious study of the Scriptures, since every man will congratulate himself on having apprehended the spirit of Christianity, though he pays little attention to statements which, to others who interpret them more *profoundly*, seem to be of the greatest importance. Examples of this are at hand. If these

statements do not commend themselves to him who is penetrated by the spirit of Christianity, and therefore in no danger of being killed by the letter, what else can be the reason, save that they belong to a portion of the apostolic teaching which was not affected by the action of the Holy Spirit? I tremble at the thought of all the spirits which will then in the name of Christianity besmear us — at the Christs that will be set before us, if the peculiar spirit of every individual pretending to be moulded by the spirit of Christianity, shall assert its own genuineness, and the word shall no longer avail to exorcise it. If the authority of the word is maintained, we shall always be called to examine as to what is Christian truth; while on the other hand this spirit, which claims independence of the letter, declines even the labor of exchanging a word in self-justification with the slaves of the letter, and, in harmony with its own nature, *knows* itself to be in full, though not exclusive, possession of the truth. It permits others to enjoy a different creed, but carefully avoids an impartial examination and estimate of their belief. I cannot repress my grief in view of the fact that in our day the *truth* is treated by many who should be its trusty friends, with great assurance and unconcern, as something which can be held and shaped in this way, or in that, without injury; and this low estimate of the intrinsic value of truth appears to have attracted the authors of the theory of inspiration defended by Elwart, since a God's Word, having authority as such, seemed to them to restrain one's own inclination within too narrow limits.

Yet pardon this expression of regret! We now proceed to call attention to the fact noticed above, that, although hard-fought battles have been waged in every age on certain points of Biblical doctrine, these have been waged out of regard to essential, weighty, fundamental truths of Christianity, as the latter seemed to different persons, according to their peculiar tendencies, to lack merely the certainty given by a more adequate doctrinal statement; so that the cardinal truths of the Bible were not assailed at their foundation, and the only mistake was this, that it was not observed how all these statements bore witness to the ground-truth. Thus, *e. g.*, many

different views have been entertained respecting the reconciliation which is effected by grace between the sinner and God ; but whoever adheres to the word does not doubt the fact that sin involves guilt before God. Only a view which ignores the word, can bring out as Christian a theory wherein the idea of guilt, and with it the idea of God's righteousness, retire into the back-ground.

But our own age furnishes proof that it is only necessary to reject, as a prejudice prevailing among Christians, the assumption that what the New Testament expresses is to bind our faith, in order to secure the admission that it is by no means difficult to ascertain its teachings. For scholars who differ most widely from one another in their creed, agree very exactly as to what the New Testament *asserts*; but while one party bows to these assertions as authoritative, the other pronounces them unworthy of credence. In this first, unbiased minds see proof that, independently of Christian experience and particular disposition, *well-defined* views are expressed by the Apostles, and that a knowledge of the contents of the New Testament may be gained and *presented to* faith for reception, instead of being *derived from* faith. Thus the free-thinking of our age, of whose worth or worthlessness in other respects we cannot now speak, has done us one service ; it has shown the groundlessness of the charge that it is quite impossible to reach any certain conclusion in respect to the essential contents of Biblical doctrine as such. Hitherto a demonstration of this possibility has been wanting, because every one intended to show every modification of his subjective belief to be contained in the Bible ; while now those who believe the Bible — along with such as repudiate without shame all faith in that book — are led to distinguish the statements of Scripture from their own apprehension of those statements.

Hence they deem it sufficient to show that their subjective views are in *agreement* with the word of God ; while formerly they deemed it necessary to show that every item of their creed was *alone* grounded in the Bible. Thus, while the domain of the truth laid down in the Scriptures is more perfectly separated from the domain of human additions, the

united and faithful labors of those who honor the *word* of Holy Scripture, and fear to burden that Scripture with any thing of their own, will contribute to bring out more and more fully the genuine contents of the Sacred Record, and even thereby to justify the same as divine and authoritative.

Thus, *e. g.*, the discussions respecting the Trinity would have led to very different results, if men had consented to hold themselves strictly to the data given in the Bible, and had not insisted exclusively on their own *theory* built on these data. But we can only wonder how (p. 92, sq.) the fate of this doctrine could have been developed along with the proofs of the impracticability of maintaining the word of Scripture. Here the controversy arose from a discontent with the results to be derived from the word of Scripture: of which results a doubt may still remain in many minds, whether *Nitzsch* himself has been successful in giving them a true and adequate expression.

I must also confess my surprise that faith in the entire truthfulness of the statements of the New Testament is opposed (p. 96) to an exegesis which assumes the presence of figurative speech in the Holy Scriptures, and is said to imply, logically, that all idealizing, every deviation from the verbal sense (he should have said the literal sense) is pernicious. With the crudest theory of the Holy Spirit's action, a theory which makes the Apostles rude machines through which He speaks or writes, the use of suitable metaphors to depict vividly the truth would not be excluded. Did not Christ himself often speak in parables? Whatever reasonable idea we may conceive of the teaching influence of the Spirit, will not our reverence for the Divine origin of this instruction *logically* dictate the use of all helps, in order to discover, in its purity and substance, the truth, which is given of necessity in a human way? Would not the opposite course, which, instead of finding a *meaning*, satisfied itself with having a word of undetermined import, be illogical and inconsistent?

The stronger our conviction that each and every expression of the Holy Spirit holds a *truth* to be appropriated by us, the more irresistibly shall we be urged to inquire what this truth

is, which is contained in certain words, or metaphors, or tropical expressions, as the case may be. Indeed, by such exaggerations and imputations, entirely foreign to the nature of the subject, no correct judgment can be secured on the matter now in debate. So, also, the man who asserts that Dogmatic Theology, if it aims to be Christian, is not authorized to change the substance of truth laid down in the Holy Scriptures, would be strangely misunderstood if his view were said to imply (p. 96) that Dogmatic Theology must not adapt its form of thought to that of its own time. For he simply wished to assert that the *truth* itself should not be sacrificed to present modes of expression and forms of thought, or that what is at war with Christian truth — not what departs from the original form in which that truth was imparted — cannot be honorably sent forth under that title. Fully recognizing and admitting the fact, that the truth should verify its adaptation to all, and its fruitfulness, by *entering into* the spirit of the age, however expressed, it will be his right and duty to warn men that the spirit of the age, even though provided with somewhat derived from Christianity, is not Christianity, and will not be accepted as such. While that which is Christian has respect to the spirit of the time, enters into it, and selects a form both agreeable and intelligible to it, it will not have to appropriate the *errors* and *misconceptions* which cleave to that spirit. The spirit of the time may indeed be totally irreconcilable with the spirit of Christianity; and when it is so, Dogmatic Theology must either refuse to transplant it into Christian soil, or cease itself to be Christian. Thus it was no Christian Theology when it paid homage to the theory that man must find redemption by and from himself. It might have entered into the language and conceptions of the age, in order to correct the latter, and to show in what respect there was truth in that theory, etc.; but when it honored the spirit of the age *by accepting that theory*, and adapting itself to the same, it might indeed lay claim to many excellencies, *but that of being Christian it forfeited*. So, also, does that Dogmatic Theology which gives itself up to the force of the *pantheistic* current, forfeit the excellence of being Christian, however

amply it furnishes itself with Christian phrases and representations. For, undeniably, the belief in a *holy* God, and hence a God independent of the world and not identical with it, is fundamental in Christianity. And if we accept Christianity only in so far as it is compatible with this pantheistic spirit of the age, which is hostile to its nature, and our theology is ready not only to barter away the form, but also the substance of the faith, this theology is no longer Christian. The task of a Christian Theology would be to enter into the pantheistic current for the purpose, indeed, of appropriating whatever is good in itself and in harmony with Christian truth, and also for the purpose of rejecting decidedly whatever is wrong in itself, or incompatible with Christian truths rightly apprehended. The eternal truth of divine revelation is made a servant of the every day wisdom of the human understanding, when any system whatsoever is first devised, and then Christian truth forced into that system. This truth is fully able to make a system for itself, and to enter into the language and philosophy of the times, not, indeed, for the purpose of accepting these beforehand as true, but for the purpose of elucidating their relation to itself; and this relation may be one of contradiction.

We now proceed to consider our last question, viz: *Whether safe criteria for separating the form from the essence of Christian truth can be given, and so a limit be placed to that which is traced to the form?*

The respectable author, whom we have in view, seems partly to doubt the possibility of distinct boundaries; and yet in some respects he carries them out farther than can be allowed.

Thus, *e. g.*, he extends the form in which Christian truth is clothed, to the notions of the understanding, which he says (p. 88) must belong to the form or drapery, because the substance of our religion lies deeper than the intellect. Yet (p. 91, sq.) "the spirit of Christianity is not a bodiless phantom, wholly unrelated to religious knowledge; to a certain extent it must be infallible and capable of being derived infallibly from the Scriptures." Such must be the central doctrines, or

those truths which are the most obvious and direct expression of the spirit of the Christian religion, while those which lie remote from the centre are capable of a looser statement.

Here again, as it appears to me, we have an instance of confusion analogous to one noticed above. Because the substance of religion lies deeper than the intellect, therefore the conceptions of the understanding belong to the form. Without doubt, as Christians of every age have acknowledged, the essence of religion — meaning by this *piety* in the soul — does not consist in knowledge; but does it follow from this, that the knowledge, which underlies such piety, needs no stability or precision? If a man of small knowledge may have a genuine and fruitful faith, is it therefore immaterial what amount of knowledge is at the believer's command, and certain that he will not be benefited by an increase of well-defined and wholesome truth? If truth, although defective or imperfectly expressed, can effect more in one who truly apprehends it, than a large amount of the same truth, more perfectly expressed, in one who does not truly apprehend it; in other words, if one side of the spiritual nature may be cultivated without an equal culture of another side of that nature, and if the former seems to be of more consequence than the latter, does it follow that what is offered to the other side of the spiritual nature is superfluous, and its character a matter of indifference? If truth imperfectly apprehended is a blessing, must we declare it to be of little importance whether we appropriate truth perfectly or imperfectly? If we bear in mind the intimate connection which subsists between truth and truth, as well as between received truth and awakened life, we shall hardly be able to accept the proposition, that truth "to a certain extent" infallible, may be asserted as to the principal fact, but not as to the doctrines remote from that fact. What standard of measurement, I ask, have we for the remoteness of one doctrine from another, and for their want of any relation one to another? Have we these points in our spiritual being, whose influence can be held securely at a distance from other points of the same? Is truth, though mingled with error, so distinguishable from it, that this or that

man will not miss the truth which is "to a certain extent" infallible, and mould his views and life by the mingled error? Especially, as every man must already *possess* the true life, in order to have a proper stand-point for separating that which is true from that which is false? Is it not then of the greatest moment, that a perfectly correct image of the truth be set before us in the Scriptures, to which the erring mind may resort for counsel and correction? To admit this, we need not discard the distinction between fundamental and subsidiary doctrines. The former will always be distinguished by this fact, that they are the centre from which the others radiate, as it were. But they are proved to be such a centre only when all the rest lead back to them, as well as proceed from them. Now in finding the central truth, no aid can be derived from a side-doctrine erroneously stated, but only from one correctly stated. Nay, more, these side-doctrines erroneously stated, must tend to hinder the discovery of the central truth. Hence we cannot endorse this atomic separation, which, in spite of the erroneousness of the outer circle of doctrines, remains unconcerned for the safety of the central truth. This would only then be possible, if the single truths of Christianity lay side by side, without contact or connection. But while the spiritual nature of man is a united whole, one truth may indeed outshine another, but the splendor of this brighter truth is dimmed by another lying in darkness by its side. Hence no ground-truth that underlies and conditions the Christian life is safe, unless the illuminating action of the Holy Spirit pervaded the whole spiritual nature of the Apostles, so that the doctrines lying beside the ground-truth were set in their proper light, and therefore correctly revealed.

We must also confess that we cannot perceive how the truth, communicated by the Holy Spirit, must of necessity be falsified by entering into the mind of one who shares the opinions of his age, although there may be no little error in the circle of those opinions. May not the Spirit's action be corrective? Just as often a human thought, communicated to us, suffices to change our whole belief, yet without doing any injury to our freedom or distinctive peculiarities. This at

least is to be presumed, that the truth brought to man by the Holy Spirit, touches the proper centre of spiritual life, and moulds this aright. Grant that the form of statement which this truth received from the Apostles was Judaistic, and modified by their earlier opinions ; it does not follow that their minds were not so controlled by the inspired truth, as to express by means of that form the truth in its purity. Let us take, for example, the ancient prophets, to whom the Spirit communicated the idea of an ultimate union of all nations in worshipping the true God ! If this thought is represented by those dwelling in the land of Judea, under the figure of the coming-up of all nations to the sacred mount in Jerusalem, and by Daniel, under the figure of a kingdom before which all other kingdoms at last disappear ; does the *idea* lose any of its truth or purity by this variety of representation. Did the manifoldness of the parables, by which Christ delineated so vividly the nature of the kingdom of God, diminish in any measure the purity and truth of the idea to be conveyed to the Jews, or rather tend to correct their former errors ? If the blessing which lies in the atoning death of Christ, is sometimes represented under the image of a love which sacrifices life for the deliverance of a friend, sometimes under the image of a ransom paid for the deliverance of a captive, and sometimes under the image of a propitiatory sacrifice offered to God ; does the truth suffer loss by this variety of expression, or is it not rather, by the use of known conceptions, more distinctly and effectively presented to the mind ? Hence we cannot admit, that a writer, by employing the existing modes of thought, must necessarily incorporate in his writings the errors of the time. Least of all do we assume this by conceding that Christianity, had it been planted originally on other than Jewish soil, would have had another coloring. Yet the New Testament and the facts of the case lead us to believe that Christianity, as a work of Divine Providence and the fulfillment of a prior educational system, could have grown up on none but a Jewish soil, because here alone was found the preparation, not of error but of *truth*, which, according to the purpose of God, conditioned its intro-

duction into the world. Here it found the necessary groundwork of *truth*, which it could preserve without change, into whatever soil it might be transplanted. In no other circumstances could Jesus have asserted and justified his claim to be the Christ; but he never ceases, wherever the gospel is preached, to be the Christ; and this, because salvation was to be from the Jews (Jo. iv: 22), not because this was a Jewish conception, which might elsewhere with just as much propriety have been a very different thing. I am therefore far from esteeming the whole impress which Christianity bears, by virtue of its appearing first among the Jews, to be external and worthless. Judaism, as opposed to heathenism, was *truth*; and Christianity could never have taken root, save where the faith in false gods had *given place* to a recognition of the God honored by the Jews as the only true God. Among the Jews, men were led to Christ by the *acknowledged authority* of the divine revelation possessed by them already; in all other places, a *surrender of previous faith* was indispensable in order to faith in Christ. There is an unchangeable element of actual fact, which preceded Christianity in the training of the Jewish people, and *could precede in this only*; and the recognition of this element conditions the reception of Christianity, determines of what people the Saviour should be, and impresses on the religion a Jewish stamp, not to be removed without taking away also the *Christian* stamp. Thus the position, that Christianity, had it first appeared on other than Jewish soil, would have taken on a wholly different aspect, cannot be admitted, since the purpose of God, which had from the beginning prepared it to appear on Jewish soil only, could not otherwise have been carried into effect. Hence Christ, although assured of his mission to fix the faith of all nations, more distinctly recognized this as the territory on which he was to make his appearance. That Christianity sprang up on Jewish soil, because here was a treasure of religious truth and history to which it could attach itself, seems to be forgotten by many in our day, who treat whatever religious conceptions were found in being and appropriated by Christianity, as something to be separated from

the latter as a foreign element. Since Christianity will take root nowhere save on Jewish soil, even because paganism has no stock for it, but can only, torn from its own stock, be grafted in — as Paul affirms, who wrought most effectually for the reception of the heathen into the fellowship of Christians (Ro., xi : 16–18); it is a purely arbitrary treatment of Christianity not to recognize its fundamental relation to Judaism as being very different from its relation to paganism, but to divest it of its Jewish garb, and ignore its connection with Jewish history.

Hence it is plain that, in so far as Christianity is related to, and connected with, the facts recorded in the Old Testament, these facts cannot be deemed non-essential to it; yet we do not deny, we rather admit, that Christianity, brought under the influence of different forms of thought and gaining influence over them, will experience many a change. But sad would be the lot of men, deplorable the portion of their spiritual nature, if their subjective needs could only be met by a change, that is, a falsification of truth, or if there could be no appropriation or expression of it by the individual mind, save at the cost of some of its elements. But where is the evidence that the entrance of certain truths into minds diversely constituted, must perforce originate discordant views of truth? This theory is based upon a false idea of the reception of Christianity, namely, the idea that truth is deduced from the life or experience; so that from the unity of the life are developed manifold truths, and not from the eternal unity of the truth endless varieties of life; and hence the truth and its exact nature must be referred to mere form. In reality, therefore, the concession that “to a certain extent” the ground-truth is infallible, or that it is not necessarily changeable, is due to some faint and lingering recognition of the absolute value of truth. Let the theory in question be followed out to its natural conclusion, and we can no longer speak of an infallible truth, one that claims sacred authority among men; and indeed the supporters of this theory illustrate the indifference to which it leads in regard to the preservation of any part of Christian truth as forever sacred.

The ground of this error may be discovered in a failure to ascertain and ponder the nature of truth. The more genuine this is, the more *creative* power is there in it, and the less will it suffer by the necessary diversity of form under which it is expressed ; for it creates the form according to circumstances, and not the form it. As we understand the matter, we have no reason whatever to place the conceptions of the intellect so entirely in the territory of form — which may change without injury to the substance of truth — as to affirm that these conceptions may be erroneous without injury ; nor have we any reason to say that every peculiarity of expression necessarily involves some error. According to this view, if the light of Christian truth penetrates heathenism, it has power, if appropriated, to make darkness *retire*, instead of being penetrated and at least partially perverted by the darkness. And although this process will and must be imperfect in the individual, yet the truth is laid down in the word for this very reason, that it may in its purity drive the shadow farther and still farther away. A variety of conceptions will indeed be found, in which the truth may be clothed, without vitiating its substance ; and this new form may serve an excellent purpose in setting forth and applying the unchangeable truth. In the New Testament itself we have a very precious example of these two facts, that the truth is able to assume a wholly new form, when there is need of it, and that the substance of the truth suffers no injury at all by this process ; this example is afforded us in the prologue of John's Gospel considered in relation to that gospel itself, and also in this Gospel considered in relation to the other Gospels. In the prologue we hear a language which is not repeated in the rest of the Gospel. Christ, the Son of God, is here brought before us under the designation of Logos ; and an image of him is sketched, which belongs to a mode of speculation no trace of which meets us again in this Gospel. Yet we shall all readily admit that the Gospel is adapted to just those readers the circle of whose conceptions is entered in the prologue, to give them the details which they needed, and thus to justify as truthful the theory of Christ, which had been brought out

in the prologue in their own language and mode of thinking. The Gospel then accomplishes, in a satisfactory manner, its purpose. But the prologue employs language such as we never hear from the lips of Christ himself, or any from of his apostles. Yet we cannot show that any erroneous idea is involved in the form here chosen; it expresses the truth without any mixture of error. At the same time the readers were relied upon as able to appropriate correctly what was laid before them, though it were given in a language differing from that which must be chosen to relate the historical facts of the Gospel; and as the apostle showed that he was not restricted, in *imparting* truth, to forms of speech already in use, so his readers were supposed not to be so dependent on their own mode of thought that they could not ascertain the meaning of that which was suitably expressed, though not in their idiom. It was enough to have given them a point of view from which the full and unperverted truth of Christianity could be easily received by them. The prologue, to be sure, did not confirm all their earlier ideas of the Logos; but correcting their views, it showed what conception of Christ is formed, if the designation Logos is chosen to set forth the correct idea of Him. By this designation of Christ as the Logos, John does not bring into Christianity the error which had been associated with this title, and which was foreign to the true idea of Christ; but by *rejecting this erroneous element*, he shows how the unchangeable truth of Christianity may be put in this form of expression and conception. And at the same time, from the life, teaching, and works of Christ, he unfolds a body of facts, adapted to fix and secure what was true in this representation of the Divine nature, as dwelling in Jesus, and manifested through him. By the selection of facts which John here makes, we come to know more aspects of the nature and working of Christ, or at least to have a more definite view of them, than in the other Gospels. But so far is this from proving the account of Christ, in its details, whether in the other Gospels or in this, to be erroneous, that the fulness of the truth rather justifies itself by its greater richness and more inexhaustible fruitfulness. We should, therefore, teach

our nature to let the one Christ as well as the other — *i. e.*, Christ set forth in this way as well as that—dwell in us; then it will be seen how consistent and related is the truth which we have in the one and the other form.

Thus we have proof of the three points which the opposite theory does not seem to admit: (1.) A presentation of truth which has respect to an entirely different circle of ideas, and even enters into the same, need not thereby appropriate anything erroneous; it is rather the function of truth to exhibit error as incompatible with itself, and to reject it as incompatible. (2.) The actual and historical facts of Christianity permit one to make choice of those facts or truths which are adapted to existing necessities, and will correct known errors. (3.) Nothing wrong or ungentle is hereby of necessity mixed with the truth, even in points remote from the centre, according to the chosen form of speech. But the inexhaustible and blessed fulness of the truth will thereby make itself known to the observer.

Hence we are not forced to regard the truth as something cold and dead, in order to prove it capable of being apprehended without error in all its details, and also capable of such an expression that this or that individual shall joyfully submit his own errors to the correction of truth, instead of being bound inexorably to error, and disfiguring truth by it.

We shall not then fix the limit of that which appertains to form, where we are expected to fix it. For we ascribe to form whatever is required or produced by the peculiarities of men, in order on the one hand to receive the truth, or, on the other, to induce others to receive it. The form gives the drapery, or rather is the drapery, under which the truth appears. Should we concede that the form may mingle error with the truth, it is clear that it would no longer be the genuine, pure truth, but a spurious corrupted truth, about which the drapery of form would be cast. In such a theory there is manifestly a confounding of the nature with the form. So far is the form from marring the contents of truth, that its proper office is to express the latter in such a way that all subjective difficulties and hindrances to the reception of it may be set aside. The

subjective nature will be so controlled by the power of truth as to enter into its service ; the form will be shaped by the truth, and not conversely the truth by the form. This can be satisfactorily shown by the examples alleged in support of the opposite view. If the relation of the two sons of Abraham, Isaac and Ishmael, and of their two mothers, is made use of (Gal., iv : 21) to illustrate the relation of Christianity to Judaism, and the character of each ; we may not, it is true, feel any want in our Christian consciousness, should nothing be added to our knowledge by this parallel between the Old Testament dispensation and the New. But we are not the persons for whom this elucidation of a truth, important to us also, was primarily intended ; and so, of course, we are not the persons whom the form of illustration here chosen especially benefits. Yet it does not therefore contain anything erroneous. The law which God put in operation in his dealings with those personages of the Old Testament, is the same which obtained in case of the two dispensations ; so that the Jews could find the same God ordering and acting in the one as in the other. Hence for them the allegory was purely instructive, foisting in no grain of error.

Similar remarks apply to the Epistle to the Hebrews. If the author had in view readers who were captivated by the splendor of the Levitical worship, and fascinated by its peculiarities, it was his task to set before them the excellence of Christianity in contrast and comparison with Judaism. Hence the chief thought pervading this epistle : such and such points of the Jewish system you prize ; but in a higher sense, and in a more satisfactory form, which leaves nothing to be desired by you, you have the same also in Christianity. This sort of reasoning, assuredly, neither has, nor *can* have, anything attractive to our hearts or intellects, because our views and tendencies are totally unlike those of the Jewish Christians at that time. But does it then follow that the chosen form of appeal infused error into their minds ? Was it not perfectly adapted to free them from their errors, and to gain for unadulterated Christian truth an entrance into their mind in the only way in which it could be gained. And if we

now search for the ideas which were unfolded and maintained under this form, we can draw from this exhibition of Christianity the most precious and fruitful treasure of unperverted truth. And while we are filled with admiration at the variety of forms under which Christian truth may be brought to the souls of men, we cannot assert that we should have been able (cf. p. 88) to appreciate the blessings of Christianity as highly as we now do, without having this comparison of them with the provisions of Judaism. Besides, *love* is enkindled within at the evidence of the many different directions in which Christianity went forth to victory ; and it will picture to itself how, even in this way, by virtue of its mastery of form, it was fitted to conquer the hearts of men. But we shall also make valuable additions to our Christian knowledge, if we investigate the contents of truth by a comparison of the different forms of speech in which it is clothed, and do not forget the fact, that no expression of Christian truth by its first vouchers can be carefully studied, without finding new aspects of that truth revealed, verifying its authority and proving it to be light as well as life.

Essentially different from these two examples, is a third, which is placed between them, namely, the parallel drawn in Rom., v. : 12, sq., between Christ and Adam, where we should lose nothing, it is said, in the doctrine of the natural depravity of man, if it was not traced back to the fall of Adam ; nay, more, the way in which Adam's transgression is used to explain what the Redeemer did for mankind, can be recognized by us as no proof of the historical truth of the fact employed. Does not an obvious objection present itself to this view ? If the depravity of which we are conscious need not be connected with the fall of Adam, is there any more need of connecting the redemption of which we are conscious, with the work of Christ ? Whoever needs no Christ, in order to enjoy the latter, will very properly insist on the inquiry, How can it be proved that the connection of redemption with a revealed Christ is not a product of Jewish modes of thinking, as truly and fully as the connection of human depravity with the fall of Adam ? An advantage which has fallen to mankind in the course of

history is here elucidated, beyond a doubt, as to its value and meaning, by comparison with a disadvantage which had likewise befallen it in the course of history. Hence this reference to the fall of Adam is not a mere figure, used to make a particular truth more evident and apprehensible; for then the nature of depravity could have been described just as correctly and intelligibly without deriving it from Adam; but this reference is a simple appeal to something actually true or actually false. Whoever makes it the latter, will find it hard to discover any principle on which he can consistently maintain the desert of Christ, as one who has actually appeared to redeem men from sinful corruption, to be infallible truth. Paul refers to difficulties, also, which could only present themselves were the fall of Adam supposed to be a fact, and he solves them likewise, as they might be solved in case, and only in case, the fall were an historical fact. Thus this example seems to me to prove the uncertainty of every Christian truth which rests on a historical basis, if the limits of form are made so comprehensive as Elwert proposes — the form involving error without injury to the ground-truth. Of a truth "*to a certain extent*" infallible, and to be derived infallibly from the Scriptures, we confess ourselves unable to form any idea. Something, *only to a certain extent* infallible, is plainly *not infallible*. And we apprehend that the whole sum of infallible truth to be drawn from the Bible, according to the maxims of our author, might be reduced to the appearance of Christ among men, while every man would be left to form such an idea of his work and merits as his subjective nature approved.

But if the New Testament itself affords incontestible proofs that the Apostles incorporated error in their doctrine, no theory incompatible with this fact can be maintained. Fortunately, however, the proofs alleged in the treatise under review need not, I think, give us much solicitude. For, first, we cannot admit the validity of the statement so often repeated in this work, that it would be illogical to concede errors in the details of history, and yet deny their presence in doctrine. If we suppose that the action of the Holy Spirit, in teaching the Apostles, was designed to qualify them to fulfil their *calling*,

it was not necessary for this *purpose* to guard against discrepancies like the following: When there were two demoniacs, or blind men, who had desired and obtained help from Jesus, this narrator called to mind but one of them, perhaps the speaker, while another recollected that there were two of them. So, from the history of Christ's resurrection, this and that event might have been narrated to one as of special importance, and he arranges them accordingly; while another directs his narrative to that which had specially arrested his own attention; so that it may now be difficult for us to fix with confidence the chronology of events. So, also, in giving the relation of a certain "taxing" to the time of the governorship of Quirinius, a mistake might be made (especially by a narrator who was not an Apostle): but what connection has all this with the task which the Holy Spirit was to qualify the Apostles to perform? Did the Christian *truth*, which they were called to communicate in its purity, suffer in the least by all this? Such apparent contradictions—for it is remarkable that for every thing of this kind, so patiently culled out, a resort to conciliation is possible—*possible*, since no instance has been produced where some method of harmonizing these discrepancies is not conceivable—such apparent contradictions, I say, are to be estimated and settled at an earlier stage of inquiry, namely, in answering the great preliminary question: Whether the New Testament writers are *trustworthy* historians?—a question to the answer of which we cannot fitly make any contributions in this place. According to the view which ought, in our judgment, to be taken of the influence of the Divine Spirit in qualifying the Apostles for their work, we can in no case rationally expect them to appeal to the inspiration of the Spirit, when the question relates to the establishing of historical truth, but only (cf. p. 41) as did John (xix: 35, xxi: 24), to the respect which belonged to them in the Church as trustworthy men. It would have been a suspicious circumstance, had they wished to cut off, at this point, by an appeal to *apostolic* authority, the right of testing their statements. No less compatible with a correct view of the influence of the Divine Spirit upon them, is the fact, that the character of

epistles which contain doctrine — infallible doctrine — seems to be dependent on many outward circumstances, *e. g.*, whether they be longer or shorter, be directed to a wider or a narrower circle of readers, as is plain from Gal., vi : 11, I. Thess., v : 27, Col., iv : 16, II. Thess., ii : 15, Heb., xiii : 22. We should have a very inconsistent idea of an apostle if we should think otherwise. And if, according to II. Pet., iii : 15, sq., there are in the epistles of Paul many things “hard to be understood,” we perceive nothing in this fact which the influence of the Holy Spirit should have prevented. For the readers to whom the epistles were directed possessed different degrees of knowledge ; that which some were able to apprehend correctly, and which could be withheld from them only at the cost of checking the growth of their Christian life, others would understand with difficulty, and misunderstand in part, or perhaps misuse. This casts no shadow on the action of the Divine Spirit, for that action does not assume to make all who hear of Christianity alike, so that all truth is for all. It rather qualified Paul “to become all things to all men.” Hence it follows, that all Christians might not be able at once to receive in a proper manner every thing written by Paul. Jesus himself could not communicate to all every thing which He communicated to his Apostles, and even these were not ripe for all which he had to communicate.

Finally, to uphold our view, we should not hesitate to admit that Paul said of himself (I. Cor., ii : 13), that he spake in words of the Spirit, because he judged that the spiritual belongs to the spiritual, *i. e.*, that it is proper to exhibit a revelation from the Spirit, in a form adapted to its character. For this would show that Paul rejected the oratorical tricks of that age as not suited to the preaching of the Gospel, and preferred a simple form of discourse, worthy of the subject. That the Divine Spirit made him successful in carrying out this purpose, was not thereby excluded. This very perception and acknowledgment that the form ought to correspond with the spirit, may have been itself a fruit of the Spirit. Besides, the meaning of the words, *πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ συγχαρίνοντες*, does not seem to be, “adjudging to spiritual (in contents)

spiritual (in form)," but rather this, "comparing spiritual with spiritual;" by which means his pleading did not contain the arbitrary thoughts of man along with the truth revealed by the Spirit, but whatever did not prove to have the Divine stamp was rejected.

But the cases yet remain, in which the Apostles were manifestly deceived. Of these, we are told (p. 87, sq.,) a great *multitude* occur. But as it was not the plan to carry out this point in detail in the treatise under review, we also have not this great sum to investigate and justify. Besides, we are here referred to that which is pretty uniformly and exclusively brought forward in this connection, namely, the use of the Old Testament by the Apostles, and their expectation of the speedy coming of Christ. And these certainly are points which cannot be disposed of by a few dogmatical remarks, on the one side or the other. We may, however, remark, without anticipating any exhaustive discussion of this topic, that, so far as the Old Testament passages cited in Heb., i: 5, are concerned, a third, very simple way of justifying them is at hand, without charging the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews with misinterpreting the Old Testament. For, instead of saying to the Hebrews, to whom, according to the whole structure of the epistle, it was not necessary to offer *proof* that Jesus was the Son of God, "To which of the angels has God promised the dignity of being his Son?" the writer might well say, "To which of the angels said God at any time (to which of the angels has God ever addressed such words as we find in this extract from Ps. ii., or II. Sam., vii.), Thou art my Son; to-day I declare thy filial relation to me;" or, "I will show myself a father to him, and he shall show himself a son to me?" Until the incorrectness of this exposition, which may be justified by incontestible analogies from Oriental writers, and also from this very letter to the Hebrews, shall be pointed out, the passages in question cannot be taken as proof of error in the views which are laid down in the New Testament.

As to the supposed expectation of the Apostles, that Christ would soon appear for the last time, it must in the first place be shown, that those interpreters are mistaken who do not feel

themselves authorized to understand the final coming of the Lord to judgment, to be meant by every coming or appearing of Christ, to which the readers of the New Testament are referred. In the Old Testament, every solemn manifestation of a Divine attribute in history is called a coming of the Lord. Then, in the second place, it must be shown that, in contrast with the doubtful and contested explanation of such passages as may *possibly* be interpreted of the final coming of Christ in that generation, those passages deserve no attention which declare with the greatest confidence that the Gospel, in harmony with its nature, is yet to be possessed by all mankind ; and the Apostles, *e. g.*, Paul, must have had very just ideas, from their own experience, of the time which was requisite for the achievement of such a victory. If the weight of every proof-text, upon the one side or the other, were fairly recognized, it would be seen whether it is an artful shift or a truthful response, which denies that the Apostles definitely expected the last advent of Christ as close at hand. Furthermore, as Christ had expressly declared that nothing definite respecting the day and hour of his final coming could be known by man, since the Father had reserved this knowledge to himself, the expectation of this event, even if harmless to Christians, was something which did not belong to the illuminating Spirit to produce. The only mistake of the Apostles would have been in fixing in their minds as definite, at least to a certain extent, that which is entirely indefinable. But here it might be shown as psychologically probable, that the understanding of the Apostles in respect to their own Christian consciousness — to say nothing of any aid or influence of the Spirit — could not lead them to expect the final coming of the Lord as very near ; for however desirous they were to tarry for *a* coming of the Lord, he himself had given them a view of his coming, from the destruction of Jerusalem onward, in a more striking and victorious increase of his kingdom.

In view of such considerations, which present themselves to us as fairly requiring us to maintain, not precisely the *letter*, but the *spirit* embodied in the *word* of Scripture, we do not find that theory which assumes the action of the Holy

Spirit in the Apostles to have excluded error from the *contents* of Christianity, to be refuted by facts. Hence these contents, as laid down in the New Testament, must be regarded and treated as infallible.

In conclusion, we must be allowed to protest against that interpretation of the words: τὸ γράμμα ἀποκτείνει, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωοποιεῖ, which makes them prove that it is a truly Christian view to conceive of the action of the Holy Spirit in the Apostles as permitting error in their doctrine. The opposite of this would be the view which regards every letter of doctrine as infallible. But it is unnecessary for us to show at length that the words in question have no reference at all to this point. Paul is speaking of two dispensations, the Jewish and the Christian; the former he designates γράμμα, the latter πνεῦμα. Of their opposite character it is said in the words before us, that the one, by making literal prescriptions, brings death to man (or exhibits him in his sinful and condemned state), while the other, by laying hold of the innermost spiritual nature of man, brings life (or exhibits him in a state of salvation and reconciliation to God, through the broken power of sin). Now is there any intimation in this, that in Old Testament times every letter of revelation might and should have been esteemed infallible, while in New Testament times it is a characteristic of faith to presuppose a mixture of error and truth in revelation? Instead of this, it is Paul's aim to make his readers realize that a view of the purpose of Divine love was first made possible by the new dispensation, and to excite in them grateful joy that the full light has appeared in Christ. A reception of him is the power (πνεῦμα) which lays hold of the deepest nature of man, and is therefore (v. 17) true freedom. This freedom will be gained by us, we believe, if we receive this Christ and just as the revelation of the Holy Spirit describes him and his work, but not as our own nature, without Christ, and enslaved to sin, may choose to fashion him.

By conceding the authority of the *word*, we hope to enjoy the *spirit in its purity*. We will now, in conclusion, exhibit the results of our investigation, in brief propositions:

1. The influence of the Divine Spirit upon the Apostles must not be thought to have impaired the *freedom* and *individuality* of their human spirits ; these were rather purified, elevated, and made fruitful.

2. This action of the Divine Spirit stimulated the Christian life of the Apostles in a very eminent degree, in harmony with the demands of their calling ; and, to make their teaching trustworthy, this action included instruction.

3. The qualification for their work promised to the Apostles consisted in a correct view of the *whole* sum of Christian truth, and they bore themselves always as if in possession of such a view.

4. It is in perfect accordance with the psychological laws of the human spirit, that *the life should be developed from known truth*, and not conversely the truth from the life. *Life is manifold, truth by nature one.*

5. Unless it be admitted, that in the *word*, from which, as from a fountain, Christian truth is to be drawn, those doctrines which branch out into *particulars* are a *correct, unperverted expression of Christian truth*, the *essential contents* and very nature of Christianity seem to be left *insecure* and exposed to manifold attacks and injuries.

6. The *bounds of form* must not be so fixed, that error is necessarily mixed with truth — though not to the injury of its nature. The form is but a *robe* for the eternal, immutable truth ; and this it would cease to be, if by means of it, *instead* of the pure and genuine truth, a distortion of the same was brought to view. By its creative power the truth takes into its service, rules and shapes the form, and not the form it.

Thus we have given a satisfactory account, as we believe, of the sense, in which (Eph., ii: 12, sq.) we are to be built on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Christ being the corner-stone ; we also hope to be, not strangers and sojourners, but fellow citizens of the saints and of the household of God.

ARTICLE IV.—DEMOCRACY ON ITS TRIAL.*

BY H. W. RICHARDSON, TUTOR IN WATERVILLE COLLEGE.

OUR Republic is arraigned on a very ancient indictment: it is that to which Socrates of Athens was called to plead. We are charged with neglect of the gods the Old World worships, introduction of other new divinities, and corruption of the ingenuous youth of England—Mr. Bright, Mr. Gladstone, and others. The case of the Commonwealth of England *vs.* the American Republic is fairly in court; and judgment is claimed by the writer† conducting the prosecution, under the act of Prov., xii., 19: *The lip of truth shall be established for ever: but a lying tongue is but for a moment.* According to this advocate, our national offence is rank. We have exhibited the first consistent application of the democratic theory to the practical problems arising in the government of a large state. What is worse, we have presented for more than half a century the appearance of success overshadowing all precedent. Not to mention our responsibility for French revolutions, English reform, looking no longer to the correction of petty wrongs but away to ultimate democracy, owes its new aims to our example. Our success was a lie; our experiment is a failure; our influence, pernicious. So the argument culminates; and, it should be observed, the last, *criminal* charge rests on all the others.

We might safely demur to this declaration. It is not proved, though asserted, that the development of European politics has been sensibly affected by American example. We have indeed got far enough from the spirit of the snug maxim, *a Deo rex, a rege lex*, so familiar to Englishmen under the Stuarts; but our departure from that doctrine is only part and parcel of a grander movement, embracing the whole course of

*London Quarterly Review, No. ccxix., Art. 8 July, 1861.

† Scotice.

modern history, bearing all nations with it, chafing against immemorial barriers in Europe, but here flowing on without restraint. The seeds of such changes as appear in English Reform were planted in the sixteenth century. The democratic theories of that and later ages were destined to ripen into democratic practice, more slowly but not less certainly in England than in America. "Sidney, Locke, and Milton were deeply infected by them," says our prosecutor.* How deeply, let Sidney himself testify :

"The whole fabric of tyranny will be much weakened, if we prove that nations have a right to make their own laws, constitute their own magistrates ; and that such as are so constituted owe an account of their actions to those by whom and for whom they are appointed."†

These words, and such as these, were worth a man's life in 1683 ; the same proposition was enounced as an axiom in 1776, by the American Congress ; to-day, despotism itself is based on the consent of the governed. Says Blackstone, touching the growth of English constitutional liberty :

"Our ancestors heard with detestation and horror those sentiments, rudely delivered and pushed to most absurd extremes by the violence of a Cade and a Tyler, which have since been applauded with a zeal almost rising to idolatry, when softened and recommended by the eloquence, the moderation, and the arguments of a Sidney, a Locke, and a Milton."‡

Finally, hear DeTocqueville :

"This country has attained the consequences of the democratic revolution, which we are undergoing, without having experienced the revolution itself. The emigrants, who fixed themselves on the shores of America in the beginning of the seventeenth century, severed the democratic principle from all the principles which repressed it in the old communities of Europe, and transplanted it unalloyed to the New World."§

Here are witnesses of approved integrity and sagacity. It were easy to add to the bulk, but not to the weight, of such testimony. What shall we think of men who see in the Liberal party of England only a reflection of American influence, and not rather the efflorescence of English, of Euro-

* Page 129.

† Discourses on Government, chap. i., sec. 1. This book, it will be remembered, was offered as evidence of treason at Sidney's trial, while still in manuscript, and admitted by the monstrous decision of Jeffrey's, *scribere est agere*.

‡ Comm. on the Laws of England. Book IV., ch. 33.

§ Democracy in America. Reeve. Part I., p. 11.

pean, thought in American institutions? If democracy is our national taint, it is inherited.

All things move. What was reform yesterday is conservatism to-day, and will be barbarism to-morrow; but the old feud remains. What a shout goes up: Democracy has failed, is borne

"Sulphures curru flammivolisque rotis,"

into the heaven of speculation, or the limbo of folly, whence it came to vex the world. This is no case for special pleading. The United States of America are not disunited. The Southern States are no more out of the Union than was Ireland out of the British Empire in 1689. There is in fact a close resemblance between the revolution, so frequently styled glorious in Parliamentary acts,* which placed William of Orange on the throne of the Stuarts, and the present joyful uprising of a great nation in America. Now, as then, the appeal to arms is local and partial—the resistance, not of a community, but of a class to the authority of the people. The sudden ripening of public sentiment, which gave to the English revolution all its worth, stripping royalty of its sanctity for ever and making its tenure of power and right of succession alike dependent on good behavior, may also find a parallel in our history. As James II. taught his subjects the duty of kings, so Southern politicians are teaching us the duty of citizens. He staked his power on popery; they theirs on slavery. It is a losing game: the world has outgrown them both. To Americans, it seems absurd to doubt that the Republic will emerge unshattered from this sea of troubles. Practical success justifies all theories. It was perhaps natural, to assume prematurely the failure and wreck of the American system of government. Let it be remembered, nevertheless, that this is a question of fact still undecided, to be tried only by the ordeal of battle.

The ordeal of battle!—Is civil war then a legitimate result

* See, for example, Statutes of the Realm. 2d Gul. & Mar. c. 3: "With thankfulness and admiration calling to remembrance his majestyes glorious and successful undertaking for the deliverance of the people of this Nation from Popery and Arbitrary Power," &c.

from the practical operation of the American system? Is this the success which was to justify the democratic theory? This question is the pivot on which the whole case turns. The reply to this accusation must be ample and convincing. How then is the charge sustained? To avoid any shadow of mistake let us hear the brief of the counsel for the prosecution :*

"We have passed in as full review as our scanty limits will permit, the inherent defects to which the American Republic owes the calamities under which it is now suffering. [1] That spirit of mutual concession, through which alone, whether in public or private affairs, co-operation is made possible, was wanting to the untaught and passionate energy of the multitude. The majority pursued its civil victories in the spirit of warlike conquerors, dismissing with a contemptuous *Vae victis!* the remonstrances of the minority. [2] At last the minority despaired. They had been groaning for years under the crushing bondage of the Northern Protectionists, and they looked forward with an exaggerated though not an unnatural terror, to the mastery of Northern Abolitionists. They betook themselves to the only appeal which lies against tyranny upon earth. [3] The Democracy proved too weak to defend the despotism it had set up. Of set purpose it had exhausted every contrivance for the sake of enervating its executive; and, in the hour of need, it called for a strong Government in vain. [4] Crippled by the disloyalty of some of its chief officials, and the indifference of the rest, enfeebled by the systematic withdrawal of every first-class man from public affairs, the Government of Washington has exhibited a pitiable mixture of inopportune apathy and inopportune fury. [5] While timely efforts might possibly have extinguished the evil, it sat with folded hands, and watched the conflagration spreading from State to State. When all had seceded who could secede, and the revolvers had reached their acme of power, its caprices shifted suddenly; it threw away all hope of peaceful separation, and plunged into an aimless civil war. [6] The tree must be judged by its fruits. Institutions must be valued not according to their theoretic symmetry, but according to their results. The United States have had advantages of which few monarchies could boast — an order-loving race, a secure frontier, a land of boundless wealth. In spite of these advantages, they have committed the last folly of nations, a fratricidal war. The new system of political navigation, whose faultless logic was to put all our old anomalies to shame, has ended by wrecking the good ship in a smooth sea."

The whole scope of the argument against democracy is exhibited in this abstract. What now is the weighty authority for this version† of our history? No American records are cited; only one American witness is called for the prosecution. Who is the man, whose word is the solitary exponent

* Page 146.

† We mean, of course, *per-version*.

Vol. xxvii.*—7

of our democracy? Who indeed, but — Mr. Jefferson Davis! “There is no room for controversy on the subject,” says the prosecutor.* But, really, we are compelled to challenge the right of Mr. Davis to appear in this case; because, if it should be shown that democratic majorities are guiltless of the imputed acts of injustice, the witness himself would stand convicted of a very grave offence. We cannot admit his evidence, and we need not. The archives of the Government are open to us; and should we need commentary, there are men whose utterance is not affected by the stricture of a real or imaginary halter.

Whether the untaught energy of the multitude is, or is not, incapable of concession, we shall not now stop to consider. Let us get to particulars as quickly as may be; and first of all, to the relief of a South groaning with infinite pathos under the bondage of Northern Protectionists. “The protective policy,” it is asserted, “had been forced at first by the sheer weight of a majority on the reluctant South. . . . The South felt the double sting of humiliation and loss.”† How easily is this sting extracted! The first bill introduced at the first session of Congress in 1789, by James Madison, representative from Virginia, embraced the protective principle, applied both to manufactures and navigation.‡ While this bill was pending, petitions praying for protection were received from Baltimore, in Maryland, and Charleston, South Carolina.§ The second act passed by this Congress is entitled, “An act for laying a duty on goods, wares, and merchandises, imported into the United States,” and designed, according to the preamble, “for the support of Government, for the discharge of the debts of the United States, *and the encouragement and protection of manufactures.*”|| The third was “An act imposing duties on tonnage,” with a proper discrimination in favor of American bottoms.¶ During the debate, Edanus Burke, representative from South Carolina, said of his constituents:

* Page 140. † Page 141.

‡ See Gales's Annals of Congress, 1st Cong., 1st Sess., p. 102.

§ Gales, U. S., pp. 115, 123. || Gales, U. S., p. 2129.

¶ Gales, U. S., p. 2132.

"So far from being jealous of the Eastern States, they look forward to some future day, when their navigation will be secured to that part of the Union. They know that it possesses superior maritime advantages, and expect they will hereafter afford security to them. They know that from the spirit and industry of the people of New England, they may derive commercial and agricultural advantages."*

Nor were these wise provisions, commending themselves to all who desired the prosperity of the whole nation, without suitable compensations. Tobacco, sugar, cotton, were all protected by the original act. The culture of sugar and cotton was in fact created by this policy. The sugar interest has always favored protection. The extension of the cotton culture by the invention of Whitney's cotton gin in 1792, and the monopoly so long enjoyed by the cotton-raising States, have rendered it needless for them. Nevertheless it was for their advantage, and at their instigation, that the protective policy, always recognized as a right, was permanently adopted in 1816. Mr. Everett, whose broad patriotism has been the shining target of partizans in both sections, whose evidence therefore has peculiar weight, says on this point :

"The manufacturing system, as a great Northern interest, is the child of the restrictive policy of 1807-12, and of the war. That policy was pursued against the earnest opposition of the North, and to the temporary prostration of their commerce, navigation, and fisheries. Their capital was driven in this way into manufactures, and on the return of peace, the foundations of the protective system were laid in the square-yard duty on cotton fabrics, in the support of which Mr. Calhoun, advised that the growth of the manufacture would open a new market for the staple of the South, took the lead." †

A policy, which it would certainly be wrong, perhaps impossible, to abandon, after attracting capital into manufactures by the promise of protection, was thus inaugurated. The importance of the step was pointed out by the opposition. With a clear preception of its irrevocable nature, a Southern majority voted for a protective tariff. The duty on cotton manufactures was raised from 12½ to 25 per cent. ad valorem. The

* Gales, U. S., p. 256.

† Address delivered in the Academy of Music, in New York, on the 4th of July, 1861, p. 265. This address, which needs no recommendation, is republished in London by Trubner & Co.

division was not geographical, though the opposition was chiefly concentrated in Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina.* The senators from South Carolina, and most of her representatives, favored the measure. Calhoun regarded it as a means of strengthening the Union. Referring to causes which had brought ruin upon other States, he uttered this warning :

"There are none that apply to us, or apply with a force to alarm. The basis of our Republic is too broad, and its structure too strong to be shaken by them. Its extension and organization will be found to afford effectual security against their operation ; but let it be deeply impressed on the heart of this House and country, that while they guard against the old, they expose us to a new and terrible danger — disunion."†

Who would have dreamed, that this was the man and this the measure, destined within twenty years to shake our government to its base? Calhoun had just entered his thirty-fifth year ; he had represented South Carolina in Congress for five years. From his father, Patrick Calhoun, he had inherited the mingled prudence and passion which springs from the blending of races in the North of Ireland.‡ His private character was blameless. Gifted with rare colloquial power, he delighted in the society of young men, and rarely failed to exercise the greatest influence over them. Calm, dignified, logical in thought and clear in statement, determined, persistent, he united all the qualities of a great parliamentary leader, not without the final charm of substantial integrity. His errors

* See the recorded votes, Gales, 14th Cong., 1st Sess., pp. 331, 1352.

† Gales, U. S., p. 1336.

‡ Parton's *Life of Andrew Jackson*, Vol. III., p. 685: "No man will ever be able quite to comprehend Andrew Jackson, who has not personally known a Scotch-Irishman. More than he was any thing else, he was a North-of-Irelander. A tenacious, pugnacious race ; honest, yet capable of dissimulation ; often angry, but most prudent when most furious ; endowed by nature with the gift of extracting from every affair and every relation all the strife it can be made to yield ; at home and among dependents, all tenderness and generosity ; to opponents, violent, ungenerous, prone to believe the very worst of them ; a race that means to tell the truth, but when excited by anger or warped by prejudice, incapable of either telling or remembering or knowing the truth ; not taking kindly to culture, but able to achieve wonderful things without it ; a strange blending of the best and the worst qualities of two races."

were of the most dangerous kind — the errors of an honest and active reason. The “systematic withdrawal of every first-class man from public affairs” is sufficiently disproved by the presence of such a man in our national councils ; and he was not without peers. His vast and injurious influence with his social equals is a proof, for once melancholy, that democratic equality does not leave affairs of state in the hands of

“A crew of patches, rude mechanicals
That work for bread,”

as the prosecutor seems to think.* In the efficient supervision of the details of the Department of War under Monroe, from 1817 to 1825, Calhoun exhibited a degree of practical ability, which even his friends had not suspected. “I have a great admiration for Mr. Calhoun, and think few men in our country have more enlarged and liberal views of the true policy of the National Government,” said Story of Massachusetts, in 1823.† “He is a most captivating man,” says Wirt of Virginia, in 1824, adding with fine discrimination, “He is at present a little too sanguine, a little too rapid and tenacious ; but he is full of the kindest feelings and the most correct principles, and another presidential term will, I think, mellow him for any service of his country.”‡ The opposition to the tariff of 1824 was very strong, and decidedly, though by no means purely, sectional. The votes of Massachusetts and South Carolina stand arrayed against those of Virginia and Ohio.§ Calhoun was elected Vice President the same year. In 1827, a bill introduced in accordance with the settled policy of the government, for the relief and protection of the woolen man-

* What a reckless misrepresentation is this, on p. 130 : “The quaint figment called ‘the rights of man’ furnished the major premiss of the great argument. It became an article of political faith, that though men or bodies of men might err, and though statesmen of character and education were peculiarly liable to frailties, intellectual and moral, the mob in the street, starving, violent, and unwashed, were exempt from this human weakness.” Dear Shade of Uncle Toby, help us out with *Lillibulero*, the only fit response to all this !

† Life and Letters of Joseph Story, Vol. I., p. 426.

‡ Kennedy’s Memoirs of the Life of William Wirt, Vol. II., p. 161.

§ Gales, 18th Cong., 1st Sess., pp. 743, 2429.

ufactures, was lost in the Senate after passing the House of Representatives, by his casting vote.*

The moral significance of this act is prodigious. The man, who ten years before urged a protective tariff on Congress as a safeguard against disunion, exercises his privilege as President of the Senate, to defeat protection. Must we understand therefore, that he means disunion now? Happily, we are not left to conjecture. A posthumous treatise on government furnishes the clue by which to trace the labyrinthine windings of his course. Read the proposition on which his theory is founded :

"A tendency originating in the constitution of man cannot depend on the number by whom the powers of the government may be wielded. Be it greater or smaller, a majority or a minority, it must equally partake of an attribute inherent in each individual composing it; and, as in each the individual is stronger than the social feelings, the one would have the same tendency as the other to oppression and abuse of power. The reason applies to government in all its forms — whether it be that of the one, the few, or the many."†

He was deeply persuaded, that all governments tend to tyranny; and he was not the man to shrink from any conclusions to which his premises might lead him. Except as a possibility, we do not believe Calhoun contemplated disunion in 1827. But the manufacturing and agricultural interests of the North and South were plainly diverse. Diversity of interest, in his view, must lead to aggression. He accepted the hostility of the two sections as inevitable. Believing that a permanent majority on either hand would develop an oppression, which would break up the Union, he saw no hope when the balance of power should be destroyed. His blow at protection, therefore, was designed quite as much to cripple the growing North as to relieve the South.

Great as Calhoun's personal popularity was, it cannot be supposed that he was able at once to set on foot a Southern movement for the preservation of an abstract balance of power. His genius is conspicuous in the skilful adaptation of means

* Senate Journal, 19th Cong., 2d Sess., p. 245.

† Disquisition on Government, p. 23.

to his end. The Southern tradition of colonial wealth, and memory of Federal power, were fading into the reality of comparative stagnation. Clinging to a social system discarded at the North—a system which choked the very springs of prosperity, discouraging free labor and so checking immigration—their politicians were ready to adopt any but the true explanation of their changed relations. It was easy to throw the blame on unequal legislation; easier still to sow suspicion and jealousy in soil fitted for their reception by the slow operation of fatal causes. Liberty substructed by Slavery is aristocratic. No influential middle class can consist with servile labor. “The really remarkable fact, which is to be inferred from the conduct of the Southern States,” says our prosecutor, “is the genuine alarm with which they regarded the workings of Democracy. *Strictly speaking, they were not Democracies themselves.*”^{*} It was little wonder that the planter, whose black laborers belonged to him, bone and muscle, should hold in slight esteem the vote of the black laborer in New England, who claimed to be his countryman. Wealth and intelligence combined to concentrate political power in the hands of the few; education and habit inspired them not with alarm, but disdain, as they regarded the operation of the democratic theory. A government which assumes to take a State out of this Union, not merely without consulting its people, but in opposition to their express mandate, cannot well be styled democratic. This is the latest result of an institution which, in the early days of our national existence, lay cold and dark, a magazine of evils, waiting only the spark of opportunity to burst into deadly explosion.

The measure which had been defeated by Calhoun, was again brought forward in 1828. The bill, loaded with obnoxious amendments by the well-managed alliance of the free trade party, with every petty interest tending to distort and pervert its national character, became what it was fitly called, a “Bill of Abominations.” Such as it was, however, the friends of protection adopted and supported it, to the great

^{*}Page 142.

disappointment of their opponents. Calhoun was not the man to sit down quietly under defeat. Foiled in Congress, the great leader with his allies fell back on the people. Disaffection grew rife throughout the South. The new law, open to criticism at so many points, was loudly condemned as unjust, unconstitutional. The proposed remedy was characteristically deduced from the postulate, that all governments, without exception, are disposed to tyranny. In a government of the majority, then, some means of self-protection must be reserved to the minority. Never was intellectual hardihood greater than this man's. The *reductio ad absurdum* finds no place in his logic. The only examples of his system in history, are the Polish Diet, and the Grand Council of the aboriginal confederacy of the Six Nations ; and he does not shrink from the defence, nay, eulogy, of these august bodies.* Each member of these assemblies had an absolute negative on every measure proposed. Such a negative Calhoun claimed for every State in the Union, representing the Constitution as a compact, not to be broken without good cause indeed, but leaving to the States their original sovereignty in every particular, not expressly "nominated in the bond," and subject to the interpretation of each. This is the heresy, which men call Nullification. If its author's premises be granted, this conclusion, which substitutes a confederacy of independent states for our Nation, and gives us instead of a government a ponderous machine with peculiar facilities for stoppage, is just and necessary.

Early in 1829, a protest against the existing tariff was entered on the journal of the Senate, in the name of the Legislature of South Carolina. The nullification doctrine, already embraced by Georgia and Virginia, was spreading in Alabama and New York. It was the very carnival of State Rights. Western States began to demand a surrender of the public lands within their limits. Out of this claim sprang the great debate of January, 1830. Senator Hayne, of South Carolina, speaking to a resolution of inquiry respecting the sale of these

* Disquisition on Government, p. 71.

lands, assured the West of Southern sympathy in her resistance to aggressive and ruinous acts of government. "I am one of those," said he, "who believe that the very life of our system is the independence of the States." No one doubts the source of his inspiration.* His oracle, *os rabidum et fera corda domans*, presided over the Senate, and witnessed his defeat. For the parliamentary battle was lost, the Constitution stood transfigured in the great light of Webster's intellect, manifest in its original and incontrovertible intent—an instrument—neither imported from Poland nor borrowed from American savages. There remained the possibility, sure to be tested, of ingrafting the new doctrine upon it by sheer force of will. This purpose, already looking to disruption of the Union as an alternative, was foreshadowed at the annual celebration of Jefferson's birthday, on the 13th of April. The twenty-four regular toasts were surcharged with nullification; and in answer to them, President Jackson gave as the twenty-fifth, in words of Roman weight and brevity:

"Our Federal Union: It must be preserved."

Calhoun followed:—

"The Union: next to our liberty, most dear; may we all remember, that it can only be preserved by respecting the rights of the States, and distributing equally the benefit and burden of the Union."†

And so, with public dinners, in honor of Webster in New York, and of Hayne in Charleston, nullification began to pass out of speech into action. How a reduced, though still protective tariff, was adopted by the act of July, 1832, as a measure of conciliation toward the disaffected States; how the issue was nevertheless deliberately forced upon the government; how the Columbia Convention in November solemnly pronounced the act of July, null and void in South Carolina, after the 1st of February, 1833; how Governor Hayne fulmi-

* Benton's Thirty Years in the U. S. Senate, Vol. II., p. 188: "Each morning he returned reinvigorated to the contest, like Antæus, refreshed, not from a fabulous contact with mother earth, but from a real communion with Mr. Calhoun."

† Benton's Thirty Years, &c., Vol. I., p. 148.

nated war-like messages and proclamations, while Calhoun, now on the floor of the Senate, having resigned his Vice Presidency, insisted that his State was seeking nothing but a judicial decision of the case; how an unauthorized meeting of local magnates at Charleston, on the last day of January, resolved to suspend the ordinance of their State Convention until after the adjournment of Congress; how the compromise recommended by Clay, and accepted by Calhoun, was graciously considered, the ordinance of nullification formally repealed, and a victory claimed for the State—need not now be circumstantially narrated. Let it be observed, however, that in 1832, medals were struck with the legend, "*John C. Calhoun, First President of the Southern Confederacy,*" and that the pretended right was thenceforth practically abandoned.

The protective policy originated with Southern statesmen. Good or bad, it has been easily proved to be theirs. By the deliberate adoption of this policy, the national faith was pledged to its permanence; and under this implied contract, Northern capital was largely invested in manufactures. The oligarchic tendency of Southern institutions, conceded by the prosecution, brought into power a new race of politicians, instinctively opposed to democracy, who availed themselves of a depression induced by local causes, to organize a party for resistance, nominally to unequal legislation, but really to the legitimate development of the democratic principle—claiming indeed, that the two are convertible terms. Their attempted repudiation of a solemn contract was successfully resisted. These are not mere assertions; they are facts of history. It is now to be added, that the slavery agitation was thrust upon us, as a new basis for the same opposition to democracy. Fortunately, this important point is supported by the most convincing proof. We have the deposition of Senator Benton, of Missouri, born in North Carolina, identified with Southern interests from the beginning to the close of his public life; a distinguished member of the great party charged by its opponents with facile subserviency to Southern behests, and claiming for itself the high praise of a broad nationality; a soul

thoroughly honest and patriotic. These words of his will be forever memorable :

"The regular inauguration of this slavery agitation dates from the year 1835 ; but it had commenced two years before, and in this way. Nullification and disunion had commenced in 1830, upon complaint against protective tariff ; that being put down in 1833, under President Jackson's proclamation and energetic measures, was immediately substituted by the slavery agitation. Mr. Calhoun, when he went home from Congress in the spring of that year, told his friends, *that the South could never be united against the North on the tariff question—that the sugar interest of Louisiana would keep her out—and that the basis of Southern union must be shifted to the slave question.* Then all the papers in his interest, and especially the one at Washington, published by Mr. Duff Green, dropped tariff agitation and commenced upon slavery, and in two years had the agitation ripe for inauguration on the slavery question. And in tracing this agitation to its present stage, and to comprehend its rationale, it is not to be forgotten that it is a mere continuation of old tariff disunion, and preferred because more available."*

Always Calhoun ! In every scene of the great drama, moving swiftly toward its tragic consummation, this man appears as a protagonist. His first device to restore the failing strength of the South had failed ; and he looked next to the construction of new slaveholding states, which should give the waning minority a decisive negative in the Senate—a temporary expedient, to be followed by some permanent constitutional check to the power of the majority, or by disunion. Undoubtedly he preferred the former alternative ; at least, we are not compelled to believe otherwise ; but he did not shrink from the latter. In May, 1836, while the first news of the battle of San Jacinto, fought on the 21st of April, still lacked official confirmation, he proposed to recognize the independence of Texas, and admit her into the Union. The proposition failed. It is strange to look back upon the constant defeat of his measures, and the steady growth of his influence, stronger ten years after his death than ever before. His resolutions, in 1838, particularly that characterizing the "intermeddling" of petitioners to procure the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia or in the territories, "under the pretext that it is immoral or sinful," as a "dangerous attack on the institutions

* Thirty Years in the U. S. Senate, Vol. II., p. 786.

of all the slaveholding states," were received with expressions of utter dissent, by Senators Buchanan, Crittenden, Clay, Preston, Strange and Bayard—all Southern men, except the first. They were adopted only as amended and essentially modified by Clay. The treaty of annexation concluded by Calhoun, then Secretary of State, and the Texan Plenipotentiaries in 1844, while Mexico, a friendly power, still claimed her unmanageable provinces, was justly rejected by the Senate; and every tropic breeze brought back the cry, "Texas or Disunion." The actual assembling of a Southern Convention was indeed prevented by the remonstrance of citizens at Nashville, and of the press at Richmond—places publicly indicated for this purpose; but the spell was working. In February, in 1847, Calhoun introduced in the Senate, four resolutions denying the right of Congress to prohibit slavery in the territories. "I am a planter—a cotton planter," said he. "I am a Southern man and a slaveholder—a kind and a merciful one, I trust—and none the worse for being a slaveholder. I say, for one, I would rather meet any extremity upon earth than give up one inch of our equality—one inch of what belongs to us as members of this great republic." The resolutions were not pressed to a vote; but when, next year, the bill for the territorial organization of Oregon was passed, excluding slavery, he announced the end of the contest. "The separation of the North and the South," he said, "is completed. The South has now a most solemn obligation to perform, to herself, to the Constitution, to the Union." Into all the territory acquired by the treaty with Mexico, and held for the States in common, he claimed the equal right of every citizen to migrate, with his property. An idle fallacy enough; but it has troubled many honest men. He could not have fallen into a logical pitfall of this kind, had not his whole attention been absorbed in the end, toward which these steps were tending. Slavery exists only by legislative enactment in the separate States. It may as well be affirmed, that the paper currency authorized in the States, should therefore be issued in the territories, as that slavery can exist there, without special legislation; and of territorial legislation, Congress, wisely

providing for the welfare of present and future States, is the constitutional arbiter. This, however, was the ground of complaint assumed in an address to the slaveholding States, written by Calhoun in 1849; got before a strictly private meeting of the southern members of Congress, by adroit parliamentary management;* and at length, after those opposed to the movement, nearly half the whole number, had withdrawn, adopted, though not without considerable alteration. Emancipation was darkly foreboded; and a convention, distinctly recommended in the original draft, was veiled under the euphemism, "union and concert." The whole number of southern Congressmen was one hundred and twenty-one; this address received forty-two signatures, among which may be noticed that of Mr. Jefferson Davis. Calhoun's last speech was read in the Senate by Mr. Mason of Virginia, on the 4th of March, 1850. Under consideration were the resolutions introduced by Clay, "for the peace, concord, and harmony of the Union of these States, to settle and adjust amicably, all existing questions of controversy between them, arising out of the institution of slavery." He showed that the persistent agitation of these questions since 1835, was rending the Union asunder. Well might he say so. California had presented for the acceptance of Congress, a constitution shutting out slavery. "If you admit her," said he, "you endorse and give your sanction to all that has been done." His conclusion is, that the permanence of the Union depends on "the insertion of a provision in the Constitution, by an amendment, which will restore to the South in substance the power she possessed of protecting herself, before the equilibrium between the sections was destroyed by the action of this government." Three days later he was present to hear Webster's prophetic voice:

"Peaceable secession! Sir, your eyes and mine are never destined to see that miracle. The dismemberment of this vast country without convulsion! The breaking up of the fountains of the great deep without ruffling the surface! who is so foolish, I beg everybody's pardon, as to expect to see any such thing?"†

* Benton's Thirty Years, &c., Vol. II., p. 733.

† Works, Vol. V., p. 361.

Calhoun followed with a few words, and again spoke on the 13th; on the last day of the month he died. California was admitted into the Union, receiving a majority of the votes from the slaveholding States. Ten senators, notwithstanding, proposed to enter a protest, involving a threat of secession, on the Journal of the Senate. Mr. Davis of Mississippi, was one. A convention, understood to represent seven States, met at Nashville, and issued a call for a Southern Congress. "Is there a Southern man who bears a soul within his ribs," said a delegate, "who will consent to be governed by this vulgar tyranny?" To the call of the Convention, only South Carolina and Mississippi responded. The plot miscarried. What seemed to most of us a silly farce, was destined to reappear, after a long rehearsal, and with a new cast of characters, as unmistakable tragedy.

By what constitutional amendment Calhoun thought the equilibrium of the two sections might be restored, was not publicly known till after his death. In his "*Discourse on the Constitution and Government of the United States*," we read :

"It might be effected through a reorganization of the executive department, so that its powers, instead of being vested as they now are, in a single officer should be vested in two; to be so elected as that the two should be constituted the special organs and representatives of the respective sections, in the executive department of the government; and requiring each to approve all the acts of Congress, before they shall become laws."*

Only last year this executive Janus, *ancipiti mirandus imagine*, was paraded before the Senate by Mr. Hunter of Virginia, who modestly added, "I do not mean to declare that this is the only scheme upon which *I will settle*," confiding somewhat in his own fertility of invention, it seems.† The originator of the scheme found historic precedent in the duplication of Roman consuls and Spartan kings. The illustrations but poorly serve his purpose, for the consular *imperium* was alternate, not concurrent; and the dual crown of Sparta, through the bickerings and mutual jealousy of the rival families, became as insignificant politically as English

* Page 392.

† Cong. Globe, Thirty-sixth Cong., 2d Sess., p. 329.

royalty. Janus is the only prototype of Calhoun's monster :

"Me *Chaos* antiqui, nam res sum prisca, vocabant." *

If every interest exposed to oppression must be represented in the executive department of government, there is no reason for limiting the number of officers to two, or two thousand. The argument revolves constantly; and ends, where it begins, in the disintegration of society. On its author's axioms, no science of government can be constructed. If there is no source of power, free from the taint of selfishness, then all remedies for its abuse must be empirical; then, although it is proved that no aggression of Northern majorities has actually occurred, we must yet confess that the effort to erect a constitutional barrier against encroachments sure to come, was wise and just.

We have no occasion to defend those theories of "the natural perfectibility and perfection of the human race;" so roundly condemned by the prosecution.† Individuals, it cannot be gainsaid, are subject to error, both of judgment and purpose. The stability of every form of government is imperilled in its administration by men. Dr. Grote says of the English monarchy :

"The fiction of superhuman grandeur and license with the reality of an invisible strait-waistcoat, is what an Englishman has in his mind, when he speaks of a constitutional king; the events of our history have brought it to pass in England, amidst an aristocracy the most powerful that the world has yet seen, but we have still to learn whether it can be made to exist elsewhere, or whether the occurrence of a single king, at once able, aggressive, and resolute, may not suffice to break it up."‡

Hallam marks the same danger, and what is more to the purpose, the right provision for it :

"What indeed might be effected by a king at once able, active, popular, and ambitious, should such ever unfortunately appear in this country, it is not easy to predict; certainly his reign would be more dangerous, on one side or other, to the present balance of the Constitution. But against this contingent evil, or the far more probable encroachments of ministers, which, though not going the full length of despotic power, might slowly undermine and contract the rights of the people, no positive statutes can be devised, so effectual as *the vigi-*

* Ovid, *Fast.* I., 103.

† Page 134.

‡ *History of Greece*, Vol. III., p. 18.

*lance of the people themselves, and their increased means of knowing and estimating the measures of their government."**

The vigilance of the people! But what if the people do not know their own wants? Wisdom is not rated by the census. The affairs of nations are complicated, not to be unravelled by instinct. Would not the people better leave them to men formed by education and experience to their consideration and transaction? What a confusion of ideas in these objections — absolutely true, but quite beside the mark!

God is no Egyptian task master. Somewhere in the universe must be straw for our political bricks. The ingenious architect in the academy of Lagado, who proposed a method of building downward from roof to foundation, solved an easy problem compared with ours, if no foundation for government exists. True, in democracy, all the influences in the infinite degrees of human character, have free play in constituting and directing the popular decision; but the influences themselves are exposed to error, blind guidance still for the blind. These limitations cease when we rise above the economical plane of politics. God's law touches national as well as individual existence: the vital questions are always moral. The moral principles, without which ethical philosophy would be impossible, are the same for all men. "Faith, some certain dregs of conscience are yet within me," stammers the murderer in Shakspeare. These principles are never lost. As motives, they are often but dust in the balance against temptation; but apart from it, they have their weight. On the great mass of a democratic nation, these motives operate unchecked by any private interest in political measures. Classes and sections of the community are subject to such disturbing influences; but they are overborne and lost in the numbers of the majority. Subjects demanding special ability and preparation, while they are open to all, may or may not attract the attention of men intellectually fitted to deal with them; they are of minor importance. The great moral questions which have shaken the world, are so simple that a child could answer them. But

* Constitutional History of England, Vol. II., p. 459.

if these are paramount, and the right answer comes infallibly from the people, not because they are wiser or better than their statesmen, but because they are aloof from political temptation, we have found a pure source of power, and the right of a majority rests on a surer basis than any imaginary contract.

The fiction of a contract seems to have arisen from an effort to explain, what every man feels, the right of a majority to govern, not a minority, according to the vulgar sophism, but *themselves*. How securely Grotius assumes this right, in a treatise dedicated to Louis XIII. of France, and in high favor with parliamentary Englishmen, under William and Mary. (*De Jure Belli ac Pacis*. Proleg., 15.) "*Deinde vero, cum juris naturæ sit stare pactis, ab hoc ipso fonte jura civilia fluxerunt. Nam qui se cœtui alicui aggregaverant, aut homini hominibusve subjecerant, hi aut expresse promiserant, aut ex negotii natura tacite promisisse debebant intelligi, secuturos se id quod aut cœtus PARS MAJOR, aut hi, quibus delata potestas erat, constituisset.*"

This conclusion leaves no excuse for the long struggle, of which Calhoun was partly the cause and wholly the representative. The tyranny of majorities is a pure impossibility. Past and present facts justify the breadth of the statement. Compromise of moral questions is indeed impossible; but their right resolution is not an act of oppression. Of slavery, our prosecutor says: "No political events can modify the abhorrence with which we look upon a system based on so much human suffering."* Could *we* let it spread over new territory? How slowly was that issue brought home to the people of this nation! how idle now seems the fury of reformers and the fidget of politicians, who would have hastened or delayed the sure though halting footsteps of fate. There was nothing to gain, very much perhaps to lose; yet in the face of a powerful oligarchy, bent on the extension of their helotry, while our ablest statesmen were seeking a compromise which could not be, weighing the rights of the Southern minority from step to step, honestly and faithfully balancing constitutional obligations against constitutional privileges, the opposition slowly grew into a majority. Their determination will not be easily shaken. In the light of these balefires of civil war,

* Page 142.

the huge deformity of the system is at last revealed. Much has been sacrificed for peace. Leading newspapers at the North pledged their influence in advance, if a convention of all the States should be called, to arrange terms of amicable separation. A large party would have consented to the loss of national rank and power—if that were all. The conspirators demanded more—abdication of decent self-respect, acknowledgment of a principle fatal to national existence. “The same scene,” says our prosecutor again, “will be liable to be repeated at any time, in the case of the Pacific States, or of the Northwest States, or of Pennsylvania.”* This lying prophecy would have become history, had their demand been conceded. Could we permit this? The just supremacy of the government of the whole over any class or section which seeks its ends by violence, is beyond rational question. What a by-word among nations, how guilty before God and man should we become, having abandoned a trust so sacred! And yet, in the midst of this wild rebellion of an oligarchic class against a democratic nation, while the Christian thesis of the essential equality of men is met by the last argument of outworn barbarism in this wicked crusade of slavery against liberty, there are those among us, happily few, who sincerely believe that we should leave the legislative barriers toilsomely erected against overflowing evil, to be swept away by the storm, who would not oppose force to force, and who are even ready to suffer a kind of martyrdom for their faith, in the dogged spirit of the Jaslam poet :

“Call me coward, call me traiter,
Jest as suits your mean ideas,—
Here I stan', a tyrant-hater,
An' the friend o' God an' Peace !”

So hard is it for men, exempt from temptation, to endure the very shadow of unjust dealing. After this, let us hear no more of the tyranny of majorities.

We do not look to English conservatism for sympathy in our trial. That hope, shut out by the nature and circum-

* Page 146.

stances of English politics, has never been entertained. But we have a right to claim that the *ex parte* representations of Mr. Davis and of Mr. Stephens, shall not be adopted as the basis of an argument against democracy. We have a right to expect writers touching upon our history to acquaint themselves with at least the outlines of that history authentically. It is a grave question, whether to admire first the impudence or the taste of that writer, who in an article devoted to American politics, tells us that "foreigners do not feel it to be their special vocation to watch adventurers who are playing at politics, any more than if they were playing at thimble-rig."* What portentous ears are these, protruding under the skin of the British Lion! Ignorance in itself is a bare negation; when it assumes the office of instruction, its character is bravely altered. Lord Lyons, not aware that our Secretary of State merely represents the President, who is alone responsible for any executive act, and attributing executive functions, on the authority of the law officers of the British Crown, to our Congress, is simply an ambassador ignorant of the laws and usages of the country in which he resides. Lord Lyons suggesting these novel views to Secretary Seward last October, appears in a different and much more ridiculous light. Besides, a just comprehension of our history and government, so often wanting where it might be reasonably expected or even required, we have a right to demand some show of logical consistency concerning the "theoretic symmetry" of democratic institutions. For in granting this, the prosecution undoubtedly abandons its whole case. It may well be, that every constitution will require constant corrections, as its defects are practically disclosed. Theory is absolute; practice is approximative, limited by its materials. But the result of every correction is closer approximation to the perfect theory. Because wood and iron cannot be wrought into perfect curves, must coach wheels be square? or, if the

* Blackwood's Magazine, October, 1861, p. 404. The unreasoning scurrillity of this article, capped by its needless confession of ignorance, is its own sufficient refutation.

round wheel were broken, should we hear, that "it is only in the wreck of all ideals, and the collapse of all fantastic hopes that sober cynical truth can make her prosaic accents heard?"*

The remaining charges hardly support their own weight. If we admit the weakness and corruption of the administration, which had to deal with the rebellion in its first stages, the argument against democracy is not thereby strengthened. No form of government is secure from the intrusion of imbecility. There was never a conspiracy of any moment without official connivance or active helpfulness. The strict limitations of our executive effectually prevent the usurpation of undue power in ordinary times; when the nation's life is assailed, the strength of despair bursts all bonds. It is easy to sneer at "President Lincoln's high-handed proceedings;" but Macaulay, an unexpected witness in defence of democracy, tells us:

"Extraordinary and irregular vindications of public liberty are sometimes necessary; yet, however necessary, they are almost always followed by some temporary abridgment of that very liberty, and every such abridgment is a *fertile and plausible theme for sarcasm and invective.*"†

Dictatorship is the instinctive refuge of republics. Everywhere in troublous times society is resolved into its elements. Your Cromwell gets to the head of affairs, and Milton comes with him. There is only this difference. While Cromwell comes into power by violence, grim with armor and weapons of war, here the recurring election speedily sweeps incompetence and dishonesty into oblivion.

We submit to our kinsmen in England, that the charge is not proven. The eighteenth century, with its temporary alienation, is long past. Every year binds us closer to our ancestral home across the ocean. Embracing and welcoming all nations within our wide borders, we are still nearer to you than to any other. Not an American but feels a cheery glow of love and pride, when the long tale of English courage and endurance is recounted. Be sure we will not disgrace

* Page 135.

† Hist. of England, Vol. III., p. 44.

you. Civil war is not "the last folly of nations." There is infamy, and dishonor, and a shameful life not worth the living, which might be purchased by a sinful peace worse than war. How can an English scholar forget the brave, true words of the Roman satirist!

"Summum crede nefas animam præferre pudoris,
Et propter vitam vivendi perdere causas."

Our institutions are borrowed from you; all the changes which our new circumstances required, might be defended by citations from your authors. Of certain abuses — in the distribution of executive patronage, and in the machinery of elections — we are painfully aware; it is no time for correction, but do not think we forget them. We have not forgotten how Lord Russell, in answer to the enterprising Mr. Hayman of Liverpool requesting the protection of her Majesty's cruisers "in the pursuit of his legitimate trade" in our Southern ports, indirectly referred him for instructions to the fate of the other Haman of pendant memory. We believe that your government, so far as it represents the people of England, will do justly and fairly by us. We believe most firmly those manly words, which came to us warm with blessing, months ago:

"You cannot know how deeply all that is soundest and noblest in England is sympathizing with you in your great struggle. You must not judge by newspapers or magazines, though as far as I see the best of them are speaking decidedly on the right side. Not so warmly or decidedly as I could wish; for this our free trade notions and some hasty and inconsiderate speaking and writing on your side will account. But be sure that the issues are appreciated here, and while we see the awfulness of the task you have in hand, we have faith in you, we believe that if it can be done, you will do it, and we wish you, from the bottom of our hearts, God's speed!"*

* Thomas Hughes. *Tom Brown at Oxford*, Am. ed., Vol. II., Dedication to James Russell Lowell.

ARTICLE V. — POWER IN THE PULPIT.*

[BY REV. H. C. FISH, D. D., NEWARK, N. J.]

WHEN God called Aaron to the office of high-priest, he said, as a reason, "*I know that he can speak well.*" The reason was weighty. Speech is a mighty power. It is God's chief instrument in salvation. God's word at first created the world, and his word, from the lips of his servants, is to re-create it. *Ministers* are speakers by profession. With them, therefore, power of speech is of the highest moment. It was never so needful as now. The churches want many things, but nothing so much as increased power in their pulpits. It is an era of progress; and if other agencies have increased power, the pulpit must have it or lose its supremacy. It is an active, busy, noisy age; and if the pulpit would be heard, it must lift up its voice like a trumpet. It is a pretentious age; and if errorists will obtrude their false views and theories, then must the pulpit meet and explode them. It is a wicked age; and if the current of vice is to be arrested, then must the pulpit be foremost, with the soul-penetrating dispensation of the word.

But let us do honor to the Holy Spirit. The preacher, while, like other speakers, he has power to inform and excite an audience, has *not* power, in himself, to compass the great aim of preaching. The aim of preaching is different from that of other public speaking. It looks deeper. It would renew and cleanse the heart. If it fails here, it fails entirely. And fail it will without the accompanying "power from on high."

* The substance of a discourse before the Society of Inquiry of Madison University, August 18th, 1861.

The renewal of the soul is what no man, with all the wealth of learning and scholarship, and of cultivated taste and oratorical power, can accomplish. It is "not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit," saith the Lord. A sermon may be constructed after the best models; it may conform to all the rules of Homiletics; the text may be suitable and fruitful; the plan may be faultless; the execution may discover genius and judgment; there may be accurate analysis and strong reasoning; proof and motive; solidity and beauty; logic and passion; argument direct and indirect; perspicuity, purity, correctness, propriety, precision; description, antithesis, metaphor, allegory, comparison; motives from goodness, motives from happiness, motives from self-love; appeals to the sense of the beautiful, the sense of right, to the affections, the passions, the emotions; a sermon may be all this, and yet that very sermon, even though it fell from the lips of a prince of pulpit oratory, were as powerless in the renewal of a soul as in raising of the dead, if unaccompanied by the omnipotent energy of the Holy Ghost. But while the power which gives preaching success is supernatural, there are efficient modes of preaching the Gospel, and inefficient modes. There are laws of persausion; rules for influencing the mind. And these are appointed of God. Is it too much to suppose, then, that the influences of the Holy Spirit are more likely to be given in *respecting* these laws, than in the violation of them? Of Paul and Barnabas, it is said, in a particular instance, "They *so spake* that a great multitude, both of the Jews and also of the Gentiles, believed." Though a sovereign, yet the Divine Being is not an arbitrary sovereign; and it cannot be denied that there is a general connection between the means and the end in the operations of grace, as well as in those of nature. What, therefore, would affect a man *without* the Spirit, we might expect to be employed *by* the Spirit to carry conviction to the heart. Otherwise the kind of preaching were a matter of entire indifference.

Our object, then, is to determine the best methods of influencing men; or, in other words, to ascertain what are the conditions of power in the pulpit, in its human aspect. These

conditions may be classified under three heads — the *matter*, the *manner*, and the *man*.

I. — THE MATTER.

If we are to influence the mind, we must have something to do it with. And to do this successfully, we must use *truth* — must speak according to *facts*. The mind assents to what it perceives to be true. Its constitution requires this. It is adapted to what is true, and is moved by it, as is the lock by the key. And it refuses to be moved by perceived untruth. If there is mistake in the statement, or fallacy in the reasoning, and this is seen, argument is useless. Speech has then no power.

But in preaching, *religious* truth is the instrument. The preacher is the appointed student and teacher of God's word. And if he would have power, he must "preach the word." A peculiar energy attends that word. It is the "sword of the Spirit;" the "fire," and the "hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces." It is "quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword." It is "perfect, converting the soul," and "making wise the simple." Human philosophy, the wisdom of the world, has never converted a soul. It tried, and tried in vain, even to subdue the passions, and reform the life. But where the gospel goes, it demolishes the heathen temples, and sets up the reign of God. It proves itself to be "the power of God unto salvation." Strong preachers have ever been Bible-preachers. The old Reformers drew their weapons from the heavenly armory. The sermons of Bunyan, and Baxter, and Flavel, and men of their stamp, were full of God — instinct with living doctrines. Their very garb was after the Scripture pattern. Whitefield, as a custom, read the Bible with Henry's Commentary, day by day, on his knees, praying over every sentence, line, and word. Edwards and Davies were mighty in the Scriptures. Of Chalmers, it has been said, that his sermons "held the Bible in solution." Preachers who saturate their sermons with the word of God, never wear out. The manna which they bring is pure, and sweet, and freshly gathered. It never cloy. God's word is deep, and

he who studies it will ever have something new. He will never be dull, for the words of the Bible are strong, living words, and its images and descriptions are very flowers of elegance. Apt citations clench the passages of the preacher's discourse, and give sanction, dignity, positiveness, authority to it. And they shed light into his subject, like windows in houses, while to most of his hearers, certainly to the pious of them, these "very words" of the Holy Spirit are delightfully edifying. They come like sweet-throated birds, with a melody to the soul. "I dearly love the sound of scripture in a sermon," said an old minister. Who does not? We recall some of the fathers in the ministry — men of one book — the scriptural element of whose sermons (faulty in some respects) made them very gardens of spices. The people loved to hear them preach, because their discourses had the smell of the myrrh and the cassia in them.

Few preachers would not be more weighty if more scriptural. A writer asks, "Do ministers read the Bible much?" The question itself is startling. It is said of George Müller, author of the "*Life of Trust*," whom all admit to be at least a man of God, and whose preaching has been greatly blessed, that "he rises early, enters his closet, shuts the door, opens his Bible, offers a short prayer, especially to invoke the guidance of God's Spirit upon the reading and meditation of his holy word, then reads and meditates verse by verse, chapter by chapter, till his soul becomes wholly impressed with God's presence and impregnated with God's teachings." Let those who would have power in the pulpit, pursue a similar course.

But mere scripturalness does not make a strong sermon. Otherwise the recitation of inspired passages were sufficient. There must be *thought* as well. Men like to be made to think. They go to church to be instructed. The preacher, then, as a prime condition, must have something to say. It will not do to be always

"Dropping buckets into empty wells,
And growing old in drawing nothing up."

A great want of most sermons is want of matter. In this

age of mental activity and general intelligence, vigorous thinking, solid sense, are absolutely necessary to permanent pulpit success. Humanity is on the move. The very forces of nature seem at work fabricating and stimulating ideas, and they are taken up by everybody, as it were by absorption. Even plain folks, in our day, can tell the difference between a good sermon and a poor one. If the preacher depends on oratory or rhetoric, without thought, he will ultimately want a congregation. Intelligent people will tire of words, words, words, and demand *ideas*, and be apt to go where they can find them.

And again, as to matter in preaching, he who would have power must dwell much upon the two great, all-comprehensive doctrines of the Scriptures—*man a SINNER, and Christ a SAVIOUR*. Hence, the *law* will be used as an effective instrument; for “by the law is the knowledge of sin.” A full conviction of sin, says John Owen, is “a great and shaking surprisal unto a guilty soul.” This “shaking surprisal” is the first thing to be gained. One must weep because of the “*curse*” with which the Old Testament closes, or his eye will not be caught by “*the book of the generation of JESUS CHRIST*,” with which the New Testament opens. He must be taken by the hand and led up to the top of “stormy Ebal,” or he will never be ready to fly to the “sun-lit height of Gerizim.” The law must therefore be preached. It is indispensable to the authority and cogency of the pulpit—but not so much the law as the *Gospel*. Chiefly the *Cross of CHRIST*. It was unto “the *Gospel of God*” that Paul was “separated.” *SHILOH* is the great attraction, and to “*him* shall the gathering of the people be.” “And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me.” The heart will yield to the power of the cross, when it will yield to nothing else. We are told of an old emblem in the shape of a lock, constructed of rings, on each of which was a letter, and which would unlock only when those rings were so disposed as to spell the word *JESUS*. Apt emblem of the human heart. Was one *ever* known to open except to the name of *JESUS*? Chalmers was not the only preacher who had spent years in laboriously describing vice and virtue, and

urging men to be better, and all to no effect, simply because there was no "cross" in his preaching. And it is undoubtedly a chief defect in the sermons even of evangelical pulpits, that there is not enough of CHRIST in them. Pious people complain of this, especially in the sermons of those just from the "schools;" and not without cause. The criticism of a certain theological professor upon the trial sermon of a student in the Seminary, would apply to a multitude of the *moral essays* read from our pulpits. "Young man, an educated *heathen* could write just as good a sermon as that!" It is a historical fact, that the most successful ministers, in any age or country, have been those who determined, with Paul, to know nothing "save Christ and him crucified." Beyond question, Flavel was right: "The excellency of a sermon lies in the plainest discoveries and liveliest applications of Jesus Christ." He who makes Christ prominent cannot go wrong in the matter of his preaching. It is Paschal who suggests that as there is one, and but one indivisible point from which any picture can be rightly viewed, every other point being too high or too low, too near or too distant, so is there in theology, one, and but one, right point of observation, and that point is the Cross of Christ. The preacher, therefore, who takes his position there, commands a view of all revealed truth, and will be sure to present truth and duty in their just relations and proportions.

II.—THE MANNER.

From the *matter* of preaching, let us now turn to the *manner*. The word manner is here used both as to the *structure* and the *delivery* of a sermon.

1. Pulpit power is affected by the *composition* of a sermon. There is a right way and a wrong way of doing or saying any thing. Every one knows that the form of a communication affects its strength. A writing containing the same matter may be either weak or strong, attractive or repulsive, eloquent or tame. And without being minute as to all the features of effective discourse, it will be found true that *plainness*, *simplicity* and *directness*, are its prime qualities. The first thing is to be *understood*; to have the words and sentences intelligible. Paul

had rather speak "five words with the understanding," i. e., so as to be understood, "than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue."

Some men are not plain from ignorance and indolence. It is much easier to be unintelligible than intelligible. "Ah, my brethren," said Archbishop Usher, "how much learning it takes to make things plain." And we may add, *labor*, too. Some are not plain from pride of learning. Some are not plain from a desire to tickle the fancy and excite the imagination. And so they covet a "sky-rocket brilliancy," and delight in rainbows, and meteors, and earthquakes, and waterfalls, and blooming trellises, and showers of gems, and torrents of fire, and "trooping seraphim," and the "Silver chiming of the spheres," and the "weltering chaos of demolished worlds." Some are not plain from a false taste and a faulty training. They think when they enter the pulpit they must be mounted on stilts; and so they give themselves laboriously to seeking out "great swelling words," and constructing cumbrous sentences; and hence become puffy, pompous, bombastic. If there is any nourishment in their productions, it is so absorbed in sponge and fungus as to be indigestible. And some are not plain from a fondness of the abstruse. From inclination or habit, they have come to deal much in what is hidden, and remote, and difficult to be comprehended; and to present things in a blind, circuitous manner. Possibly they would like to be called "intellectual" preachers; writers of "great" sermons; men of a "logical grasp" of mind. Hence their sermons are to a great extent metaphysical disquisitions; efforts

—————to sever and divide

A hair 'twixt north and north-west side."

Common truths are tortured into obscure propositions, and plain terms are eschewed for those that are professional. The mind is entertained with the difference between the "immanent" and "eminent" volitions; the "relations of the infinite and the impossible," and the like. The sentences bristle with scholastic technicalities, and you are compelled to hear of "divine causation," and the "self-determining power of the

will," and the "objective" and "subjective," the "governmental" view of the atonement, and of "supralapsarian" and "sublapsarian" theories ; as if the production were an essay for the class-room, rather than a sermon for the pulpit.

What folly all this ! CHRIST did not preach in this manner. He was the plainest preacher in the world. Nor did the apostles, who used "words easy to be understood," and avoided things which "minister questions rather than godly edifying." Nor did the earnest men of God in any time. Ask Luther how he preached—whose words were "half-battles"—and he will tell you it was not in a way to suit the "learned men and magistrates," of whom he had many as hearers, but for "the poor, the women and children and servants," of whom he had many more. See how the staunchest of the old Puritan divines of the 17th century preached, and it will be found that it was in the homely dialect of the common working people. One may read pages and find scarcely a word of more than two syllables. Learn how the founders of Methodism preached, by Wesley's direction, "use the most common, little, easy words in the languages." It is a rule that may be everywhere observed, that whatever God makes is simple, plain, elementary. Man only complicates and obscures. The nearer we reduce things to a naked simplicity, the nearer we approach perfection. And the last place for complication and obscurity is the pulpit.

"I seek divine simplicity in him,
Who handles things divine." *

A man who cannot make things plain, is not qualified to fill a pulpit. First of all let the preacher think out his subject so thoroughly that his ideas shall lie clear and distinct, like crystals in his own mind ; and then let him remember that "a straight line is the shortest distance between two points," and speak accordingly. What right has he to use an

* It was a maxim of Roger Ascham, that "we ought to think like great minds, and speak like the common people ;" and Milton well said that "the very essence of truth is plainness and brightness : the darkness and crookedness are our own."

involved and tortuous manner when declaring the great things of God?—"darkening counsel by words without knowledge?" What right has he to come before plain people in the straight-jacket of professional dignity, and talk of "volition" instead of will, and "intellectual processes" instead of thinking, and "moral obligation" instead of duty, and the like, as if the very use of language were, as Talleyrand suggests, "to conceal one's thoughts?" What right has he to give his hearers the hard stone of metaphysics, when they are dying for the bread of heaven? What right has he to bring forward profound disquisitions and curious speculations, when the command is, "preach the preaching that I bid thee?" And what right has he to hide that Christ whom he is to make known, amid flowers of rhetoric, as Verelst, in his portrait of James II., virtually hid his majesty in a profusion of sun-flowers and tulips?* When the late young preacher, Erskine Hawes, was dying, he said, "I wish to live *to preach the Gospel more simply.*" How many at death's door have felt as he felt?

We would not be understood to discourage the utmost care in the construction and preparation of sermons. Man is an organ, and skill is required to touch rightly the keys. *Method* is important. "The preacher," it is said, "sought out and *set in order* acceptable words." Thoughts, however good, and words, however plain, may be thrown together in such a desultory and irregular manner, as to make no impression.

"Checked reason halts, her next step wants support;
Striving to climb, she tumbles from her scheme."

The mind was not made to take in and hold a mob of ideas,

* I am tormented with the desire of preaching better than I can. But I have no wish to make fine, pretty sermons; prettiness is well enough when prettiness is in its place. I like to see a pretty child, and a pretty flower, but in a sermon, prettiness is out of place. To my ear it would be any thing but commendation, should it be said to me, "you have given us a pretty sermon." If I were upon trial for my life, and my advocate should amuse the jury with his tropes and figures, burying his argument beneath a profusion of the flowers of rhetoric, I would say to him, "Tut, man, you care more for your vanity than for my hanging. Put yourself in my place—speak in view of the gallows, and you will tell your story plainly and earnestly."—*Robert Hall.*

a mass of unshapen materials. The thoughts of a discourse, therefore, must be "set in order." *Attractiveness*, too, is important. If the enemies of truth sweeten the edges of their poisoned cups with all the charms of an elegant style and lively composition, why may not ministers win men in the same way? There is force in beauty and in every variety of wise and earnest speech. The good sense, and the taste, and the imagination of hearers are not to be ignored, but rather turned to advantage. Words wisely chosen are often images of things, awakening at once many ideas, and so coming with a wealth of beauty and meaning. Christ's preaching was attractive. His discourses are gemmed with beautiful metaphors and analogies, taken, however, not from the arts, but from nature, and familiar to all. Let style, then, be cultivated. More attention might well be given to it in our schools and seminaries; especially to the acquisition of skill in converting abstract truths into glowing images, and in the use of "picked and packed" words, as Bunyan calls them, and of bold idiomatic, nervous, terse, laconic sentences.

What is complained of is *devotion to paragraphs and periods*; the cultivation of elegance of imagery and felicities of diction, at the expense of simplicity and pungency. "Prettiness" is *not* in place in the pulpit.

It is *not* the highest ideal of a sermon that it is precise and dignified, and offends no body's taste. Foster complained of Blair, that he kept his thoughts so long standing to be dressed, that they were chilled through before leaving his hands. Sermons may be elaborated till they are spoiled. They may be *so* "perfect" as to be perfectly worthless!

"They may be correctly cold and correctly dull!
Faultily faultless, icily regular, splendidly null."

Tholuck would call these literary proprieties, "dried sweetmeats in a glass jar." Such sermons are good enough to lay away as embalmed beauties, but they are totally unfit to be preached to a living congregation. Souls never cry out under them. When ministers are full of the Holy Ghost they do not preach thus. They cannot do it. The moment they are in earnest they preach in any way rather than this.

The eloquence needed for this age, is that of Pericles, which "left stings behind." Most hearers know enough; they want to be made to *feel* and to *do*. The defensive outworks of Christianity are pretty well raised; we now need to advance on the enemy, and "shell" him out from his entrenchments, by shooting fires into the souls of men. It were a blessing to some ministers who have so much "dignity" to support, and who are *so* "proper," and *so* "precise" as to break no body's heart with the hammer of truth, if Claus Harms were to cry out in their ears, as to some of the "fine writers" of his day, "*Speak negligently and incorrectly!*" A discourse had better be like a hetchel with the tow pulled out, than like a damask cushion for the hearer to lean a sleepy head upon. Better like lightning, darting zig-zig, and piercing and tearing and splitting the object it strikes, than like a letter dispatched without a direction (to use John Newton's comparison), addressed to nobody, owned by nobody, and if an hundred people were to read it, not one of them would think himself concerned in its contents. Sermons are wanted now which are made and meant to *do execution*:—sermons which grasp and make bare and wield some one mighty idea, holding it up, and turning it around, and repeating it, if need be, as does Demosthenes the one main point in his oration on the crown, until it becomes a palpable thing, and the audience *feel* its form and pressure:—sermons having the "agonistical," the *wrestling* element in them, as Aristotle calls it:—sermons put together on the principle that "force in writing consists in the maximum of sense with the minimum of words," whose sentences are pounded together until they crack, and where figure, trope, allegory, metaphor, antithesis, interrogation, anecdote—*anything* that can awaken interest and deepen impression is resorted to:—sermons supported and sinewed with the "thus saith the Lord," and then charged with living truth, and aimed *directly at the conscience and the heart*, singling out each hearer, and saying, "*Thou art the man,*" and "I have a message from *God* unto *thee*," and then making pursuit after that man, in clear, rapid, concentrated utterances, and pressing upon him, and narrowing his way, and

hemming him in, and smiting him down with terrible volleys, until, quivering and breathless, he crouches "between the law that condemns and the cross that saves."

These are the sermons most needed to give power to the pulpit.

2. Upon the *delivery* of sermons, but little can here be said. God's wisdom is seen in giving prominence to *preaching* — to the *oral* communication of his word. And he did not ordain preaching to do what the printing-press could do as well. He designed that *men* should utter the truth, with the advantages of intonation, gesture, look. And they reflect upon God's wisdom, who undervalue a good manner. It is easy to sneer at oratory, and inveigh against the study and practice of the art of elocution. But why not denounce art in *singing* as well as in *speaking*? If all must be left to nature in one case, why not in the other? Nature does not despise art. It is the office of art to lead back to nature. The rules of oratory are all drawn from nature, if they are right rules; and he who practises upon them is only conforming to nature. It is time the vulgar prejudice against ministers learning how to be public speakers were done away with. In a very important sense *manner is matter*. And instead of less attention being given to this in ministerial training, there ought to be very much more. Neglecting this is like teaching cadets in a military school how to make powder and swords, but not teaching them how to *use* them. Many a minister fails, not from want of ammunition (for he has plenty of that), but because he cannot "discharge" with effect the well-loaded weapon. His sword (to change the figure) is of the true metal, skilfully forged, and tempered, and polished, but he does not know how to stand up and wield it. Let two ministers preach precisely the same sermon. In one case the hearers are cold, unmoved, inattentive. In the other they are attracted, convinced, melted. The difference was in the delivery. Who then will deny that, in some sense, manner is matter?

What power is there in the *voice*, when skilfully managed! M. Bridaine, a French missionary, and the peer of the most

renowned orators of that eloquent nation, preached a sermon at Bagnole, at the end of which he lifted up his arms, and thrice cried in a loud voice, O Eternity! At the third repetition of this awful cry, the whole audience fell upon their knees. During three days consternation pervaded the town; and it is recorded that in the public places, young and old were heard crying aloud, "Mercy! O Lord, Mercy!" It has been said of Whitefield, that his "Hark! hark!" could conjure up Gethsemane with its faltering moon, and again awake the cry of horror-stricken Innocence; and an apostrophe to Peter on the Holy Mount would light up another Tabor, and drown it in glory from the opening heavens. All the authorities agree that a principal source of Whitefield's wonderful power was a voice of the richest compass, subject entirely to his control. Much may be done towards the acquisition of a distinct, strong, sonorous, flexible voice, where it is not natural; and too much attention cannot be given, in its training, to the modulation, or inflection, or varying of the voice, to avoid monotony, and make it the docile and faithful interpreter of the thoughts. It is certainly a sacred duty of every minister to bring to their highest perfection the organs of speech.

There is power, too, in a *smile*, or a *frown*; in the "sweet, silent rhetoric of persuading *eyes*," and in the glow of the *features*, or their solemn sadness. Doubtless, it was not with the same expression of countenance that He who spake as never man spake, cried "Wo unto you Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites!" and "If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink." There is power in *gesture*, to help the eye to anticipate each rapid utterance, and to deepen its effect. There is power in an *animated* manner. One's whole appearance in preaching may be either inspiring to an audience, or absolutely soporific: and we agree with another, that nothing can be more indecent than to hear "a dead preacher speaking to dead sinners the living truth of a living God."* So is there power in an *affectionate*

* Sydney Smith thus comments on the dead and formal style too often witnessed; "Why are we natural everywhere but in the pulpit? No man ex-

and *winning* manner, — a fine example of which was the late Robert McCheyne. And *whatever* pertaining to delivery, that is excellent and of good report, should be earnestly coveted, as among the “best gifts.”

III.—THE MAN.

We now come to those conditions of pulpit power which pertain to the *man* himself — to his inner or essential being. It is common to suppose that eloquence is a thing to be put on, that it is an outward affair. No mistake could be greater. In impressive public address, it is not so much the mouth that speaks, as the soul; not so much the manner as the sentiment and the thought which create the manner. The power consists in the action of the speaker's *soul* upon the soul of the hearer. Longinus, after describing the sublime, tells us that this sublime is “the echo of inward greatness”; and hence we ought, says he, to “spare no pains to educate our souls to grandeur, and impregnate them, as it were, with generous and enlarged ideas.” Style in writing is simply the inner being showing itself externally — the sentiment and the thought becoming visible. And the same may be said of delivery. The elocutionist cannot make a preacher. The *man* must be made first. Back of what he can touch must be something to *beget* eloquence, or he might as well attempt to

presses warm and animated feelings anywhere else, with his mouth alone, but with his whole body; he articulates with every limb, and talks from head to foot with a thousand voices. Why this holoplexia on sacred occasions alone? Why call in the aid of paralysis to piety? Is it a rule of oratory to balance the style against the subject, and to handle the most sublime truths in the dull-est language and driest manner? Is sin to be taken from men, as Eve was from Adam, by casting them into a deep slumber? Or from what possible perversion of common sense are we all to look like field preachers in Zemble, holy lumps of ice mumbed into quiescence, and stagnation, and mumbling? There is, I grant, something discouraging at present to a man of sense in the sarcastic phrase of “popular preacher;” but I am not entirely without hope that the time may come when energy in the pulpit may be no longer considered as a mark of superficial understanding; when animation and affectation will be separated; when churches will cease (as Swift says) to be public dormitories; and sleep be no longer looked upon as the most convenient vehicle of good sense.”

train an automaton. The foundation for successful public speaking, then, lies in the man himself. *What is this foundation?*

Goodness must lie at the bottom. The word is used in a broad sense to include piety, and moral excellence, and uprightness. The ancients had a maxim that no one could be eloquent but a good man. "An orator," said Cato, the censor, to his son Marcus, "is a good man skilled in speaking." And we read in another of the ancients, "Every man speaks as he lives." "A minister's life," says an old divine, "is the life of his ministry." The explanation is obvious. Weight of character (depending on real goodness) gives weight to words; while supposed insincerity, and known inconsistency of conduct, neutralize all that one can say. To the minister of Christ, then, preëminently, should apply the principle of Pope's couplet upon Longinus :

" His own example strengthens all his laws,
And is himself the great sublime he draws."

Knowledge also lies at the base of pulpit power. How can one teach unless himself taught? How can he accomplish his persuasion without acquaintance with language, and its relations to thought, and a delicate perception of the laws of association, by which what is said shall suggest "that richer part of wisdom which must forever remain unsaid?" A novice cannot even command respect. It is indispensable that a minister be well instructed in the *Scriptures*, and he should not be ignorant of the *sciences*. He should know *men*, too, as well as books. Many ministers are altogether too "bookish." They fail of influence from not knowing the material they have to operate upon. The heart of man must be interpreted, as well as the word of God, by him who would have power over an audience. He must be thoroughly acquainted with human nature — must know the feelings of men of all classes and conditions, and all the springs of action, and avenues to the soul. He is the best preacher, says one whose own success ought to qualify him to speak, "who has the best knowledge of human nature — not of the philosophy of mind in the abstract, though that is important

—but of the wants, the susceptibilities, the struggles, the temptations, the reasonings, the shifts of individual minds in regard to religion." So, also, should the preacher be able to scan the material world with a keen, discriminating eye. Mr. Spurgeon affords an example of the advantage of sensibility to the visible creation. Having occasion not long ago to prepare a sketch of his life, a note was addressed to him with this question : " Where were you educated ?" To which he answered, " Nominally at divers schools in New Market; really by *summer rambles*, hard *private studies*, and *close observation*." And no one can read his sermons without seeing everywhere the fruits of those summer rambles and that close observation. The prayer of Elisha for his servant might most profitably be prayed over the head of many a scholarly man in the sacred office, or about to enter it, " Lord open his eyes that he may see !" Of analyses, and criticisms, and propositions, and " doctrines beaten out by dialectic hammers," he is not ignorant ; but he is wholly insensible to the glory that encompasses him, and, by consequence, but half educated.

Courage in a preacher is necessary to pulpit power. It was when the people saw " the boldness of Peter and John " that they marvelled, and " took knowledge of them that they had been with Jesus." And Paul desired his brethren to pray that he might open his mouth " boldly " in preaching the gospel. Our Master taught " with authority." Authority is inherent in truth. We expect one who knows he is in the right to speak with boldness ; and Vinet, in his *Homiletics*, remarks, with truth, that the accent of authority is welcome to almost any one. We are prepossessed in favor of men who, in this world of uncertainty and perplexity, express themselves on a grave subject with confidence and command. Some preachers weaken their messages by an indecisive mode of statement giving the impression that they are either careless, or timid, or half persuaded. They qualify and guard everything, as if somebody would take exception. Instead of this, they should come saying, ' We are the servants of the Most High ! These are *his* words — not ours ; and not one jot or tittle will we abate from them, nor give subjection to opposers, no, not for

an hour!' Men dealt with thus fearlessly acknowledge the preacher's power. His courage energizes and inlocks his thoughts, and gives to them decision, majesty, strength.

Experience is necessary in an impressive preacher. There are different ways of learning things. Some of our knowledge is intuitive, or ideal — a matter of pure reason. Some is speculative, gathered by deduction, or inference. Some is the result of reading; some of instruction. But another kind, and quite different from all this, is that which we acquire by experience. And this knowledge is deepest and most actual. It is 'burnt in,' and becomes a part of our energies and powers. Now preachers want this kind of knowledge. It is needful that they be able to say, 'we have seen and felt; *therefore* we believe.' 'We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen.' It is an old saying, that the wounded is the wounding heart. One always speaks most strongly of what he has felt. Indeed, in successful discourse, one cannot go much beyond that. When the preacher is ready to cry out with Elihu of old, 'I am full of matter; the Spirit within me constraineth me; I will speak that I may be refreshed' — then look out for a torrent of irresistible utterance! Could Luther have been the giant he was in the conflict with hell, had he not felt beforehand the cogs of his terrible experience, striking him through and through, and well nigh tearing him assunder? He *knew* what he talked about. Those inward torments, compared with which the tortures of the stake were as nothing, were an essential part of his education. Hear what Bunyan says about the way he preached: "I preached what I felt; what smartingly I did feel; even that under which my poor soul did groan and tremble to astonishment. I went myself in chains to preach to them in chains; and carried that fire in my own conscience, that I persuaded them to be aware of." And it was equally true of the blissful experiences which he describes. To take an illustration outside the profession: Could Byron have described the pangs of an accusing conscience with such awful vividness as he has done in his writings, had he not *known*, in his own *experience*, that

"No ear can hear, no tongue can tell,
The tortures of that inward hell."

And could Baxter have written his "*Saint's Rest*," except for that long and weary sickness of his, in a solitary chamber in Derbyshire? It was a transcript of his own heart, and hence it had, as he says, "the greatest force on the hearts of others," of all his writings. Hence we see that a minister must draw from the depth of his own soul, if he would have power in the pulpit. And this is why God lets so many candidates for the ministry struggle and suffer as they do. "It is of difficulties that miracles are born," says La Bruyère. And so God environs with inward and outward difficulties, his young servants, that they may grow strong and know something for themselves! And this amazingly helps them to preach. Their discourses are apt to be woven and wrought out of a feeling heart, and to have definite points in them, and to come home to men's bosoms.

Industriousness lies at the base of pulpit power. We use it here as equivalent to *hard study*. Ordination does not bring omniscience. The pulpit has no magic to infuse wisdom. And previous culture is not a stock for a life time. One may have a transient popularity without study; but the cistern soon runs out, and the people get tired of drivelling and sediment. It is too late, now, to talk of God's helping those who do not help themselves. Though he made the beast of Balaam to speak, he will not countenance men in laziness. If he does not need our wisdom, he certainly does not our stupidity. It is an insult to God to go idly up and down all the week (or all but *Saturday*!), and then on Sunday bring an offering to the Lord 'which cost us nothing,' — "the blind, the lame, the sick" — "a corrupt thing for sacrifice," and ask God's blessing upon it. How can such preaching have power? * "Give attention to *reading*;" "*study* to show thyself approved," says Paul. Without this, a Samson in native talent will soon lose his locks. A strong preacher *must* keep his mental powers in working order. He *must* be a man of rigid,

* Live for your sermon; live in your sermon. Get some starling to cry sermon! sermon! sermon! The best discourses are the efflux of a man's best thoughts and feelings during the week.—[J. W. ALEXANDER.

unremitted diligence. He *must* plow, and cross plow, and subsoil his own mind, that it may yield nourishment to other minds.*

Sympathy is an element of strength. We want to see a *brother* in one who undertakes to do us good : hence if a man is persuaded that you really *love* him, you can do almost any thing with him. And sympathy is necessary to make one a *man of his time*. With all the allowance that ought to be made, there is much truth in the criticism of a foreign Review. "The pulpit is out of gear with the age; it is a piece of machinery wheeling away, apparently for the mere pleasure of wheeling, with its teeth fitting absolutely into nothing." There is not enough of the actual grappling of the pulpit upon society. It is too far away from the people. It does not speak enough of what concerns men, and meet them as it should, in their every-day living. It deals too much in dry theories and smooth abstractions. If those who stand in the pulpit were more skilful and ready to touch the plane of actual life in their preaching, and less given to "reaching vaguely after an indefinite something that very few can comprehend," the complaint that ministers "do not get hold of the people" were less frequently made. The preacher ought to be so much a man of his time, as really to feel the pulsations of the great heart of animated society throbbing in his own heart. Is it reasonable to suppose that men intensely interested in their pursuits, and in daily occurrences, can be reached and influenced by preachers who know nothing (or care nothing) of what agitates the common heart ; whose ideas, sympathies, instincts, bearings, all belong to the *fossil* period ? The men who are to move this age, adopting the motto of the Roman actor, "I am a man, and whatever concerns man concerns me," must lock in with the age, and be every whit awake, and make the gospel everywhere felt.

* "If the minister labors not to increase his stock, he is the worst thief in the parish. It is wicked for a man trusted with the improving of orphans' estates to let them lie dead by him ; much more for a minister not to improve his gifts, which I may call the town-stock given for the good of the souls of both rich and poor."—[GURNALL.

Enthusiasm is essential to power in the pulpit. Every eminent man is an enthusiast in his profession ; he thinks there is no calling like it. And he who would not esteem it a self-degradation to exchange his pulpit for a throne, is not fit to fill a pulpit. Said the venerable William Carey, when the Rangoon government had placed his son in a dignified and important office, " My son is shrivelled from a missionary into an ambassador." The dignity and magnitude of the preacher's calling should so rise upon his vision as to shut out all else. He should live, and move, and have his being for one thing — to magnify his office, to fulfil his ministry. Thus enthusiastic, he cannot be tame. Handel caught the idea of one of his great choruses from the ring of a blacksmith's hammer and anvil. Talma, the tragedian, took a hint from the impassioned, but restrained conversation of a group of men, which changed the entire style of theatric delivery. Chalmers riding on a stage-coach, and seeing the driver whip one of the horses to prevent his taking fright at an object in the distance, resolved the matter into a principle, and upon it developed his famous sermon on "*The expulsive power of a new affection.*" These men were enthusiasts, each in his profession, and everything subserved their ends. And so it will be found with any minister who is thoroughly absorbed in his profession. He is learning out of the study as well as in the study. When he goes abroad to breathe God's sweet air, and survey his beautiful world ; when he mingles in society, and watches what is going on in the world, he is adding to his stock of ideas. Everything is feeding the sources of eloquent thought. Like the bee, he is gathering honey wherever he rambles, to bring back to his pulpit-hive. Each day of the week he is preparing to feed his flock, and not the least thing, in his reading or observation, that can add to the requisite material, is allowed to escape untreasured. Thus from a living enthusiasm he waxes strong.

Earnestness, an element closely allied to the latter, is also requisite. The earnest man is intent on carrying his point. He has an *aim*, and his hearers *feel* it when he comes in contact with them. It was this that wrung from the lips of

Agrippa, "Almost thou persaudest me to be a Christian." It was this that extorted sighs, and sobs, and groans from men of all ranks when Loyola was preaching. Eminent orators are always earnest speakers. When Dr. Mason returned from Scotland, he was asked wherein laid Chalmers' strength. "In his blood-earnestness," he replied. A simple Scotch woman's description of McCheyne's preaching, told the secret of his effective appeals: "He preached as if he was dyin' a'most to have ye converted." What an increase of pulpit power if all preachers spoke with a like earnest purpose! We need men more like Christ, whose soul was all sensibility; more like Paul, who 'travailed in birth again' for immortal souls: men after the stamp of good John Welsh — son-in-law of John Knox — whose weeping would sometimes awaken his wife, whose surprise he relieved by saying, "O woman, I have the souls of three thousand to answer for, and I know not how it is with many of them!" men who could say to their flocks with Rutherford, "my witness is above, that your heaven would be two heavens to me, and the salvation of you all as two salvations to me;" and with Brainard, "I cared not where or how I lived, or what hardships I went through, so that I could but gain souls to Christ. While I was asleep, I dreamed of these things, and when I waked the first thing I thought of was this great work." A new day will dawn upon the churches, when, in answer to their prayers, a race of ministers thus earnest shall come into possession of their pulpits.

Passion is essential to the greatest effectiveness. Deep feeling is contagious. It melts and wins its way. Sermons from burning hearts set others on fire. One of the best definitions of eloquence is, "to have something to say and to *burn* to say it." If the eloquence of art be not the eloquence of the heart, it is of little worth. Sermons fabricated in the furnace are very different from sermons constructed with the cold-chisel and file. Preaching should by no means be purely emotional; nor yet should it be purely intellectual. Paul will not be suspected of mental imbecility, nor of fanatical weakness; but mark what he said to the Ephesian elders: "Remember that by the space of three years I ceased not to

warn every one of you, night and day, *with tears*." Let cold, heartless, "intellectual" preachers ponder this statement of Paul! It is manly to weep. It is a manifestation of the child-spirit, and all great men have the child-spirit in them. Quick sensibilities are of immense value to a minister. They are "the electric fluid that pervades the region of the heart, throwing its subtle influence upon the springs of thought, and shooting its lightning through every channel." Other things being equal, a man's force in this world is always just in the ratio of the force of his heart. A full hearted man is generally a powerful man. As a rule, no man can be a great preacher without great feeling. His message, like the dart of Acestes, must kindle as it is shot forth. Examine the past and the present, and the men of mark will be found to be men of the mighty heart. Let those, then, who would have power in the pulpit, aim at a high degree of subdued passion. Let them see that their altar-candle, besides being orthodox, and straight, is made to *burn*;—that their production, besides having body, has also *soul*; and in delivering it, let them be sure that the heart palpitates on the paper.*

Prayer is necessary to pulpit power. It is said of Pericles that he never ascended the rostrum without invoking the gods; much less should we without prayer. It was the deliberate opinion of an eminent minister, that even æsthetically considered, one hour of prayer is a better preparation for sermon-writing than a whole day of study. One *cannot* make an edifying sermon while the heart is motionless. He *must* have the internal instruction of the spirit, granted in answer to sincere supplication. "We will give ourselves to *prayer* and to the ministry of the word," said the apostles. Prayer,

* Says Longinus, "The heart is the source of all true eloquence." Goethe has thus paraphrased the thought:

"Persuasion, friend, comes not by toil or art;
Hard study never made the matter clearer;
'Tis the live fountain in the speaker's heart,
Sends forth the streams that melt the ravished hearer.
Would you then touch the heart, the only method known,
My worthy friend, *is first to have one of your own.*"

as one argues from this passage, is one-half of a man's ministry ; and it gives to the other half all its power and success. It is incredible how much of light, vigor, strength, sprightliness, will come to the mind from a few moments of direct communion with God. Rightly spake Payson of ministers : " It is in the *closet* that the battle is lost or won."

Faith is essential to powerful preaching. " We believe," says Paul, "*therefore* we speak." He who believes implicitly, will feel deeply and speak forcibly. Chrysostom, to help him in composing sermons, imagined the communion rails around the pulpit crowded with listening angels. Charles Simeon kept the picture of the flaming Henry Martyn hanging in his study, that it might seem to say to him, "*Be in earnest ! don't trifle ! don't trifle !*" and the good Simeon would gently bow to the speaking picture, and say, " Yes, I *will* be in earnest ; I will *not* trifle, for souls are perishing, and Jesus is to be glorified." But to the man of faith, there is present more than listening angels, or a sainted martyr, even the Omniscient MASTER, himself ; and his voice *is heard*, saying, " Be thou faithful ! Work while the day lasts ! Entreat with all long suffering and tears !" and under its influence *how can* he loiter ? *how can* he preach but with the tenderest importunity ? Summerfield, on his death bed, exclaimed, " Oh, if I might be raised again, how could I preach ! for *I have had a look into eternity !*" But faith affords such a look into eternity. Future things become present. The very surges of *eternity* seem beating against his study door. The Judge is actually coming ! The worlds are burning ! The heavens are departing ! The throne is set ! The books are open ! The questions are being put—to *him*, and to his *flock* ! and the angels are placing *these* on the right hand, *those* on the left ! *There* is heaven with its rapturous songs and myriads of shining ones ; and *there* is hell, with its

—" ——— groans that end not, and sighs
That always sigh, and tears that ever weep,
And ever fall, but not in mercy's sight :"

and with all this before him, it is impossible to be unmoved.

His spirit is stirred within him, and he exclaims,—“No! these souls shall *not* commit suicide!” And after first crying to God on his knees, he goes into his pulpit, and cries out to *them*; and there is nothing that is strong in argument, or sweet in entreaty, or thrilling in appeal, that he does not seize upon and appropriate to his mighty theme. Thus does faith give him power.

Holiness is essential to pulpit power. This is placed last because most important. Our blessed Lord said to his apostles, “Ye shall receive power *after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you*,” and he gave command that when he should be taken up from them, they “should not depart from Jerusalem, but *wait for the promise of the Father*.” They were not qualified to preach until the Divine Spirit, *in a special sense*, had come upon them. Neither is any one. This alone can bring the preacher into such relations to God, and to men, and to his work as will ensure success. The holy soul, only, is in close communication with the Almighty, whence all his help must come. “The secret of the Lord is with them that *fear him*, and he sheweth *them* his covenant.” He who lies in God’s bosom draws from “the hiding of his power,” both the wisdom to know, and the strength to wield, the word of truth. God teaches him the deep things of the kingdom, and clothes him with superhuman energy. Some can readily be recalled who have walked among us in other days, as burning and shining lights, because of their peculiar sanctity. In one sense, they were not learned and eloquent; in another sense they were. Their fellowship was with the Father and with his son Jesus Christ, and they were most acceptable and useful preachers. Their sermons were fetched up from the depths of their souls. They were fresh and entertaining. Even the texts they quoted seemed new from having been steeped in their own experience. And with what unction, and pathos, and subduing goodness they delivered their messages!

It is common to disparage the present as compared with the past; but still it is a question worthy of the most serious consideration, whether the holiness of the pulpit in other days can be found among ministers now. Is there a man living

that would not name as the *first* requisite to increased pulpit efficiency, "a new baptism of the Holy Ghost?"

How many men, now weak and common-place ministers, would become mighty in word and doctrine, if only "filled with the Holy Ghost?" The people would wonder at them, as if made anew. Much as they who preach need many things, they need nothing half so much as more communion with God — more sympathy with Christ. They are comparatively feeble as *preachers* because feeble as *Christians*. Their lips are not touched with "the coal from the altar;" therefore, the hearts of the people do not "burn within" them.

Let it be remembered, then, especially by those coming to the ministry, that the very first principle in the philosophy of *doing* good is to *be* good; that if one would have power in the pulpit, he must stand in the light of God's countenance, as the angel in John's vision stood in the sun. Let them be particularly watchful against a *professional* piety. It is easy to *appear* religious: — to speak the language, and do the duties, and exhibit the feelings of religion, when it is merely *ex-officio*, shadowy, mechanical. Awful thought, but true! Constant attention to religious subjects and religious offices is liable to induce insensibility. Professional duty becomes one's *business*, and spirituality in its performance is lost. Because engaged in holy things, the minister is esteemed holy; and he persuades himself that he is holy, and so lives on in this way; *forgetting* that a holy office does not make one holy; — *forgetting* that he may be spiritual in his pulpit and not in his closet; — *forgetting* that he may be the keeper of others' vineyards, without keeping his own; — *forgetting* that it is easier to declaim against sins in *others* than to mortify them in *himself*; — aye, forgetting that he may be the instrument of grace to others, and yet himself be *lost*!

Let ministers take heed to these things. Let the startling language of Dr. Owen ring in their ears — "He that would go down to the pit in peace, let him obtain a great repute for religion; let him preach and labor to make others better than he is himself, and in the meantime neglect to humble his heart, to walk with God in a manifest holiness and usefulness;

and he will not fail of his end." And those still more startling words from Swinnock: "It is a doleful thing to fall into hell from *under* the pulpit. But, oh! how dreadful is it to drop thither out of it!" Let all who minister in holy things, see to it that they are thoroughly *honest men without hypocrisy*. Let them taste the word before they distribute it, and be able to say with the devout Shepherd, "I have never preached a sermon to others that I had not first preached to my own soul." In so doing, they shall magnify their office. "Clothed with humility," "nourished up in the words of faith and good doctrine," and "filled with all the fulness of God," it shall be not so much they that speak as *Christ* who dwelleth in them; and their words shall most surely be "with the demonstration of the spirit and with **POWER**."

ARTICLE VI.—BAPTISM FOR THE DEAD.

[BY A. C. KENDRICK, D. D., PROFESSOR IN THE UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER.]

Inquiry into the meaning of I. Cor., xv : 29—"For what shall they do who are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? Why are they then baptized for the dead?"

WE propose subjecting to a careful reëxamination this much vexed, but always interesting passage—a passage which has been the occasion perhaps of more perplexity to commentators, of more varying opinions, and of more abundant discussion, than any other of equal brevity in the entire Scriptures. We have no far-fetched and startling theory to propose; no subtle and ingenious interpretation to defend. We believe that the true solution lies near—is to be evolved from the very scope and drift of the Apostle's thought, and yet does not lie in the quarter in which biblical scholars are now generally dis-

posed to find it. It is partly because an interpretation which we believe wholly unwarrantable, is that toward which the investigations of our time are generally (though not unanimously) drifting, that we propose to make it the subject of a fresh inquiry, and offer our humble contribution to the support of what we deem a sounder view. A view in which such men as Billroth, Rückert, Neander, Augusti, De Wette, and Meyer concur, and which is sanctioned by scholars like Alford in England, and Hodge in America, claims, for this reason, our respectful attention. We propose to give it that attention, and against this formidable array of names we hope to leave our readers with the conviction that Paul has not defaced his discussion of the resurrection by a quasi sanction of a gross superstition — that of baptizing living persons for dead ones — but that on the very face of the passage lies a meaning far more worthy of the Apostle, and (which is the chief consideration) far more in harmony with the context. We commence by translating anew both the preceding and following context of the passage, that the reader may have at once under his eye all the elements for forming his judgment. We enter into no criticism of the text, and shall not be careful in all cases where strict accuracy might admit, to depart from the received English version. In one passage alone do we adopt a materially new construction of the original, and this in a passage which has no direct connection with the immediate theme of our discussion, and for reasons which are purely philological and rhetorical; not on the ground of any substantial variation in the thought. We translate as follows:

“(16) For if the dead (strictly, if dead persons) do not rise, neither is Christ risen; (17) and if Christ is not risen, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins; (18) then also they that have fallen asleep in Christ have perished. (19) If we barely have hope in Christ in this life, we are of all men most miserable. —

(20) But now (in fact) Christ *is* risen from the dead, the first fruits of them that sleep. (21) For since through man is death, also through man is the resurrection of the dead; (22) for as in Adam all die, so also in Christ will all be made alive.

(23) But each in his own class [order]; as the first fruits, Christ; (24) then they who are Christ's at his coming; then, at the last, when he delivereth up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have destroyed all dominion, and all authority and power — (25, for he must reign until he shall have subjected all enemies under his feet) — (26) as a final enemy Death is destroyed. (27) 'For he subjected all things under his feet.' But when he [God] shall have said that all things have been subjected to him, it is manifest that [it will be] with the exception of Him who subjected to him all things: (28) and when all things shall have been subjected to him, then also the Son himself will be subject to Him who subjected to him all things, that God may be all in all.—

(29) For, what will they do who undergo baptism for the dead, if the dead do not rise at all? Why are they baptized for the dead? (30) Why do also we stand in jeopardy every hour? (31) (Daily do I die, I protest it by the glorying in you which I have in Christ Jesus our Lord.) (32) If [merely] after the manner of *men* I fought with wild beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me? (33) If the dead rise not, let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die."

The reader who has the Greek text before him, will be at no loss for the reason of most of the departures in the above from the ordinary English version. We translate, for the sake of uniformity, *καταργεῖν* *destroy*, in v. 24 as well as in in v. 26. We render *ὑποτάσσειν* uniformly *put in subjection*, or *subject*, as is done in v. 28 in the common version, and as in Hebrews, ii: 8, where the passage is cited from the Psalms, and for a like purpose. The first part of v. 27 we enclose in quotation marks, regarding it as a mere citation from the eighth Psalm to justify, in a more formal way, the parenthetical statement of v. 25. In v. 27 we follow Meyer and Alford in making God the subject of *εἰπῇ*, and rendering the verb by the perfect future, which is the natural grammatical construction, and seems unobjectionable in respect to sense,—the "saying" being thus referred to the time when the subjection of all things shall have been consummated. Our construction of verses 24, 25, 26, we leave, with one or two

remarks, to the judgment of the reader. We need not defend to the classical scholar the possibility of rendering τὸ τέλος adverbially, *at the last, finally*. The use of ὅταν with the subjunctive, is more easily explained by making it introduce the *protasis* of a hypothetical proposition, than by making it describe the accompaniments of τὸ τέλος taken as a noun. In this case, the future indicative would seem much more natural, at least in the first of the two clauses. The rhetorical advantages of our construction we believe still more decisive. While expressing no essentially different thought — for it still leaves room for that triple division of the resurrection process which many are disposed to find in it ; first, the resurrection of Christ ; then that of his people at his coming ; and finally, the general resurrection accompanying the last and crowning act in the great drama of Redemption — it gains much, we think, in the force and beauty of its exhibition. Two or three somewhat loosely connected and disjointed sentences are moulded into one of those full and rounded periods which occasionally surprise and delight us amidst the impetuous flow of Paul's careless and rapid, but energetic, and sometimes even elegant diction, culminating in precisely the statement which is specially appropriate to the Apostle's general theme, viz., the doing away and annihilating of death at and by the resurrection. In the common construction of these verses, this statement slips in as a subordinate and half incidental one. With ours it becomes the climactic and crowning member of a sentence full of weighty and majestic thought — the great and glorious fact which consummates and completes the subjection of the enemies of the Great Deliverer, and fitly accompanies his surrender of the universal sceptre to the Supreme Deity from whom it was received.

A special advantage in our construction is the clearing up of the seemingly tautological and awkward repetition in vs. 25 and 27. In the former, "For he must reign," etc., is a parenthetical and incidental assertion, introduced as the support of the hypothetical statement of his putting down all rule and authority and power, and in v. 27, having completed his main idea, he now returns to establish the incidental

statement by a formal quotation. The *ἵνα*, *for*, is here like the *ἵνα* at the close of the Lord's Prayer (Matt. vi : 14), where the Saviour, having introduced the petition, "forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors," returns, at the close of the prayer, to the clause regarding the forgiving of enemies, for the purpose of illustrating and enforcing it. We think this much better than to refer the clause, as is commonly done, to the passage immediately preceding, regarding death. Its more natural reference is to the other. We merely add that here, as in Hebrews. ii : 8, it is used in a sense entirely foreign to that which seems to lie on the surface of the original, or was probably present to the consciousness of the writer ; and it must be regarded as developing under a special inspiration, the hidden and deeper meaning of the Spirit. On the remainder of this glorious passage — on the glimpse which it opens to us of the stupendous revolutions yet to occur in the outward forms of Divine Sovereignty, when the Theanthropos, the God-Man, while retaining, in his essential oneness with the Father, his share in the sway of the Universe, and while remaining, as the son of David, king forever over his spiritual Israel, shall, as Messiah, abdicate the throne of universal empire, and — the purpose of its temporary transfer being accomplished, and the kingdom whose foundations had been laid in lowliness and tears, being consummated in triumph and glory — the sceptre shall revert from the Incarnate God to the pure and absolute Deity by whom it had been temporarily relinquished — on all this we cannot now comment, but turn to the more immediate subject of this article.

Of the thousand and one explanations of the phrase "baptized for the dead," it would be idle and beyond our limits to give a detailed enumeration. They turn partly upon differences in translation, partly in exegesis, partly in both. Some take baptism figuratively, as a baptism of afflictions and martyrdom, others literally as water baptism. Some take *ὑπέρ* in the local sense of "over, above," some as equivalent to *ἀντί*, *instead of*, others, "on behalf of, for the good of." Some explain *νεκρῶν* of the bodies of Christians, conceived as dead, others of Christ, taking the plural for the singular ; others

give it its natural sense — the dead. Hence flows a great variety of interpretations of which we can but glance cursorily at a few. The disagreement began in antiquity. Origen, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Epiphanius, Tertullian, Ambrose, all have their separate modes of unravelling the difficulty. Chrysostom understands the term “dead” of the bodies of the baptized, and refers the passage to baptism as a symbol of the resurrection. “Baptized for the dead” is his language, —“*i. e.*, for their dead bodies; for unto this thou art baptized, believing in the resurrection of the dead.” Baptism is on behalf of our bodies, as a symbol of their resurrection. Somewhat differently, but still referring it to the body, Theodoret. “He who is baptized,” says the Apostle, “is buried with his Lord, in order that, sharing in his death, he may also become a sharer in his resurrection. But if the body is dead and does not rise, why, I pray, is it baptized?” Epiphanius explains it of clinics, catechumens, who claim and receive baptism (πρὸ τῆς τελευτῆς λουτροῦ καταξιοῦντας) just before death, and this view is substantially endorsed by Calvin who refers it to such as receive baptism just over the dead, on the verge of the grave (*jam jam morituri*). Pelagius, followed by some expositors, refers the νεκρῶν to Christ, taking the plural for the singular, a usage abundantly familiar to the Greek poets, but not to be lightly assumed in prose, and especially in the New Testament. Expressions so general as Matth. ii: 20, “They are dead who sought the young child’s life,” are but imperfectly parallel. Of those who thus make the baptism to be “on behalf of, for the sake of Christ,” some understand it literally of water baptism, others figuratively, of a baptism of blood. Rosenmüller (following Nösselt and Ziegler) interprets: “*qui maximis vitæ periculis se exponunt ut moriantur*” — who expose themselves to the greatest perils of life that they may die. Luther explains thus: “To give confirmation to the resurrection, Christians caused themselves to be baptized *over* the dead, *i. e.*, over their sepulchres;” — a fanciful conceit, unwarranted by any facts from this early period, and by the New Testament use of ὑπέρ which nowhere bears the local sense of *over*. Olshausen translates literally,

"Baptized on behalf of, for the benefit of, the dead," but makes the benefit to consist in each successive baptism contributing to complete the πλήρωμα, the full number of believers that must be made up before the tenants of the sepulchre can realize the long-wished-for *Parousia* and resurrection; an interpretation, however, so improbable that Olshausen himself hardly propounds it when he abandons it for another scarcely more probable, viz: baptized *instead* of the dead, to fill up the ranks vacated by the dead — to re-place those whom death has snatched away. But under this construction, "for the dead" is a gratuitous addition. Nobody is baptized specially for this purpose, and *all* baptisms accomplish it equally. The question, therefore, "Why are they baptized for the dead?" resolves itself into, "Why are they baptized?" Bengel interprets: "Those who receive baptism and the Christian faith when they have death placed before their eyes (as it were hanging over the dead), and from old age, disease, or martyrdom are about to join themselves to the dead. Some, rejecting all the above, simply take the passage elliptically, "baptized for the dead," *i. e.*, for the resurrection of the dead.

This slight resumé of opinions will indicate the perplexity which the passage has occasioned to commentators. We cannot examine them separately, and most of them sufficiently refute themselves, being obviously the offspring of desperate, though ingenious conjecture. One needs but to read them to feel that their authors grope blindly and therefore vainly; that they have failed to utter the "open sesame" which unlocks the secret of the passage. Some translate falsely, some interpret falsely; some, both.

We have purposely left unmentioned one opinion, to which, from its wide and growing prevalence, we wish to devote a more particular consideration. It is that which takes the baptism to be literally a baptism on behalf of the dead, a baptism of living men for the benefit of persons who had died unbaptized. It assumes that a practice, which we know had some slight later prevalence in ecclesiastical antiquity, existed already in the Corinthian church, and is elevated by Paul into

the dignity of an *argumentum ex concessis* in favor of the resurrection. It was first held among the ancients, we believe, by Ambrose; was accepted by Anselm, Erasmus, Grotius, etc., and has been adopted by very many of the best recent commentators, as Billroth, Rückert, Augusti, Neander, Meyer, De Wette. Alford in England, and in this country, Dr. Hodge, of Princeton, have given it their sanction. Most of them overcome any objections which may be urged, or any difficulties which they may themselves feel, drawn from extrinsic considerations, by a confident appeal to the obvious and grammatical sense of the passage. Some find in it no difficulty whatever. Rückert, who proclaims it almost as a principle of interpretation, that the expositor should have neither faith nor feeling (and who has nearly succeeded in making his own works exemplify his principle), will not allow a moment's wavering. "The words are so clear that they contain no ambiguity whatever, and their literal sense accords so perfectly with the general train of thought, that nothing less objectionable could have been inserted." It is a good *argumentum ad hominem*, whether Paul disapproved it or not: although in fact Rückert thinks that Paul did not disapprove it. An "ideal Paul with the cultivation of the nineteenth century," might have seen with M. Rückert that "the usage was not only superstitious, but pernicious." But whether "the actual and historical Paul" had reached this correctness and clearness of spiritual perception is with him exceedingly problematical. De Wette, Meyer, Alford accept the interpretation unhesitatingly, regarding the passage as a sufficient voucher for the fact, while they do not believe in Paul's approval of the custom. Neander accedes to the explanation more reluctantly. He argues stoutly against it, and almost to the very close of his remarks gives the reader the impression that he will reject it. He says: "Thus it should seem that persons caused themselves to be baptized for the benefit of the dead. But this seems in Apostolic times exceedingly unnatural, and in contradiction with all that which assumes personal faith as indispensable. Hence at first even infant baptism was not practised. True, we find early an enlargement of the sphere of Baptism; *e. g.*, the

Shepherd of Hermas states that the Apostles, after their death, baptized the pious of the Old Covenant. But here it was always assumed that they, after death, had been led to faith in Christ, of which baptism was merely a necessary condition and means. But if baptism were to *take the place* of faith, no proclamation of the gospel would be needed. Paul could not adduce such an opinion without condemning it; but if we even grant that he could have withheld this utterance as not lying within the scope of his present object, yet how are we to explain the rise of such a superstition among the early Christians?"

"It is claimed that we have traces of such a vicarious baptism. Epiphanius speaks of such a usage among the disciples of Cerinthus. But, granting, that *in his time* the practice existed among these people, Cerinthus himself was very far from practising it. Besides Epiphanius is no reliable witness. Chrysostom, in a homily on the passage, ascribes a similar doctrine to the Marcionites. But the Marcionites of that age were an ignorant, superstitious, country people, degenerated from the free spirit of their founder. Nothing of the sort can certainly be ascribed to Marcion himself. Tertullian alleges no such charge against Marcion (*Adv. Marcion.*, V. X.) since his book *De resur. carnis.*, in treating of our passage will not assume that Paul deals in the *argumentatio ad hominem*, and knows nothing of any such usage."

When after this we find Neander himself yielding to this interpretation, we may well suppose that he found very serious difficulties attending every other. And he, in fact, adopts it only in a qualified manner. He supposes that specific cases, with which the Apostle was acquainted, may have occurred at Corinth, especially as a recent pestilence had prevailed, which had perhaps carried off many who, being brought to the faith, died before they could receive baptism; in some cases, therefore, a kinsman or near friend might have volunteered to do for the dead what he would gladly have done for himself, and the motive, at least, could not be condemned by the Apostle. "Perhaps," he adds, "Paul reserved his condemnation of the practice until his coming, and it was his disapproval of it

then, which caused it to disappear from the church." To the latter effect also Meyer.

We believe we must be pardoned if we attach more weight to Neander's arguments than to his counter conclusion. We admit that his authority, combined with that of so large a number of eminent and able interpreters, and sustained as is their judgment by the apparent, superficial, merely verbal import of the passage, is entitled to much weight. But we cannot accept even all this as ultimate, and must try to satisfy our own minds whether they have reached the real sense of the Apostle. With Rückert, we say, "give to the sacred writer nothing that is your own;" but with him we add, "take from him nothing that is his," and we shall try to pursue our examination in the spirit of both these principles.

That a practice so grossly superstitious as that of baptizing living persons for the benefit of dead ones, whether having died with or without faith—that notions so widely exaggerated of the necessity and efficacy of baptism, had already sprung up in the primitive church, and under the eye of the Apostle, and are alluded to by him not only without express censure, but with the *quasi*-sanction of being incorporated as an element into an argument for the resurrection, is intrinsically improbable, and can be admitted only on the most decisive testimony. What is that testimony? First, not one syllable about it in all the New Testament besides. No intimation either in the Acts or the Epistles of any such practice, or of any tendency towards it. Tertullian, writing late in the second century, knows nothing of the existence of any such usage even among the heretical Marcionites, against whom he wrote, and as he mentions such a possible interpretation of this passage, but only to reject and condemn it,* we may

* "Noli apostolum novum statim auctorem aut confirmatorem ejus (institutionis) denotare, ut tanto magis sisteret carnis resurrectionem quanto illi qui vanè pro mortuis baptizarentur, fide resurrectionis hoc facerent. Habemus illum alicubi unius baptismi definitorem. Igitur et pro mortuis tingui pro corporibus est tingui: mortuum enim corpus ostendimus." (Cont. Marcion. V., 10.)

We add the comment of Jacobi from Kitto's Cycl. of Bib. Literature.

assume that if it had prevailed among the Marcionites of his time, he would have certainly mentioned it. Chrysostom and Epiphanius, who wrote fully three hundred years after our Epistle was written, are our earliest vouchers for the existence of such a usage. With them it is confined to the heretical sects of the Marcionites and Cerinthians. Chrysostom tells us of the Marcionites, that if a catechumen died unbaptized, they concealed a person under the bed ; the dead man was then asked whether he wished to be baptized, and upon an affirmative reply being given by the concealed person, the latter was baptized in place of the deceased. Epiphanius, likewise, tells us of "a tradition regarding the Cerinthians, that when any person died among them before receiving baptism, others were baptized in their name, that they might undergo no punishment in the resurrection, from their failure to receive baptism." Epiphanius, Neander tells us, is no reliable authority, yet admitting that the practice prevailed among them *in his time*, it is certain, he tells us, that neither Cerinthus nor Marcion could have introduced it. The sum of the historical testimony then is, that nearly three hundred years after the Apostles, in an age when the most exaggerated notions regarding the efficacy of baptism prevailed, the usage in question existed among one or two small, heretical and ignorant sects ; yet not even then in the church generally, and not even among these at an early period. How great, then, the

"Tertullian in these words distinguishes a false application of baptism by substitution, from the general one adhered to by the Apostles ; he thinks that the Apostle confirms baptism *pro mortuis*, not in that erroneous, but in a proper sense, compatible with his other and general views of baptism. Of that erroneous practice, however, Tertullian, in this, as in the other place, evidently knows no more than what is indicated by Paul in the above passage, neither does he mention that such a custom prevailed in his time among the Marcionites or any others." Jacobi, though he accords with Neander in interpreting our passage, yet says, as the conclusion of his investigation, "All that we can infer from the above statement is, that baptism by substitution took place among the Marcionites, and perhaps, also among the Cerinthians and other smaller sects, toward the close of the fourth century, a period when the confused views of the church as to the relation of the external to the spiritual, might easily have favored that erroneous custom ; but that it existed between that period and the time when Paul wrote, is wholly unsubstantiated."

improbability that it should have already sprung up among the Corinthians, and gained a footing sufficient to secure its canonization in an apostolical epistle!

And improbable precisely among the Corinthians. There was indeed enough that was reprehensible in the Corinthian church; but it does not seem the soil favorable to the springing up of an abuse like this. Its disorders were the result rather of lax morality, lax discipline, spiritual pride, and intellectual pride, than of a superstitious and slavish ritualism. They discarded Paul for the more eloquent and philosophical Apollos; they suffered a man to live incestuously with his father's wife; they displayed their superiority to an overscrupulous conscientiousness by sitting in idols' temples, and partaking of idols' sacrifices; they desecrated the Lord's Supper by turning it into a common meal; they used their spiritual gifts for the purposes of ostentatious display, and finally, they speculated, with philosophical licentiousness, on the impossibility and absurdity of the resurrection. All their tendencies were rather in the direction of an idealistic exaltation over, and contempt of, ceremonies, than of a superstitious enslavement to them; and though we can by no means deny that amidst the multifarious abuses, speculative and practical, which had developed themselves at Corinth, there should have appeared such a strange and exceptional one as this, yet surely it is not in harmony with the general character either of the excellencies or the defects of the Corinthian church. At all events, the persons who denied the resurrection for idealistic reasons, as is evident below, are not the ones who would have been likely to be the victims of this gross and materializing superstition. Even the Apostle virtually separates those whom he is addressing from this class—"They who are baptized,")—and yet it is only as an *argumentum ad hominem* that this appeal has any value, and only with those who practised the rite that it could have any weight. We must assume, therefore, that it both existed in the Corinthian church, and precisely with those who denied the resurrection, else the argument becomes not only intrinsically, but relatively, unmeaning.

But, again, is it conceivable that such a practice should have existed at Corinth without Paul's disapproving it, and that disapproving, he should not have expressed his disapproval? nay, rather, that by incorporating it into a weighty argument, he should have seemingly given it his sanction? In a letter mainly devoted to the correction of abuses, which descends to topics such as the fact and the manner of women's speaking in the assemblies of the church, would Paul leave such a flagrant superstition as this wholly passed over except with the incidental and by inference, commendatory notice here given to it, as belonging among the minor things to be set in order when he came? If it was sufficiently prevalent to make the brief mention here made of it intelligible, then it must have been so prevalent that Paul's omission to notice it could not have been from forgetfulness, and when he *did* have occasion to call it up, could he have done so without putting a stigma upon it? for that his language does not, as Alford supposes, involve a censure, we shall see by and by.

We are told, indeed—and we grant the justness of the statement—that Paul was in the habit of attending to but one thing at a time; that, with his mind on a single point, he postponed for the time being other, perhaps intrinsically more important aspects of the case. We say we grant the justness of the statement. Paul did not, when discussing one topic, manifest the anxiety of a modern systematic theologian to guard his language against all possible cavil and misapplication; but poured forth his thoughts with unfettered freedom, and fulness of expression. Yet all this does not meet the present case, nor account for Paul's silence on so grave a matter. Two so-called analogous cases are cited from this epistle. Paul speaks, xi: 5, of a woman speaking in public, without disapproving of anything but the *manner*; while subsequently, xiv: 3, he condemns the thing itself. So again, at viii: 10, he condemns sitting at meat in an idol's temple, as if he regarded it as objectionable merely because it gave offence to the weaker brethren, and not because it was intrinsically wrong; but in x: 14–22, he denounces the thing itself as idolatry. Yet surely these

furnish but slender analogies to the case in question. They prove that Paul may refer to a practice which he disapproves, without stating at the time *every* ground on which he disapproves it. As a matter of fact, both these usages — women's speaking in the public assemblies, and the sitting at meat in idols' temples — he *has* mentioned twice in the epistle, and each time for a distinct purpose of censure. Can we find in this any reason for supposing that another really greater abuse than either of them, he would reserve entirely to a merely incidental, and virtually commendatory mention at the very close of his epistle? The case must be hard pressed that can seek for shelter under such precedents. Because in two cases, Paul, when first referring to them in terms of censure, has deferred the main ground of his condemnation to a subsequent more emphatic avowal, therefore we are authorized to suppose that he might refer to another greater evil than either, without any expression of his disapproval at all!

Another ground of objection is that the argument itself is a nullity. Even as an *argumentum ad hominem*, it has no proper force. Unless, as already observed, the deniers of the resurrection and the practicers of the rite are the same persons, it has none whatever, for the only virtue of an *ad hominem* argument is derived from the admissions of your antagonist. If he replies to you, I hold no such opinions, and believe in no such practices as those from which you argue, your argument of course falls to the ground. If those who denied the resurrection, did not themselves believe and practise this baptism for the dead, they would have replied to the Apostle: Your argument amounts to nothing with us, for the practice is superstitious and senseless any way. If you will employ such reasoning, go and urge it with those with whom it will have force. But alike the nature of the two heresies, and the expression of the Apostle, ("they who are baptized"), render it improbable that both existed with the same class of persons.

And in other respects also, the appeal is a nullity. Its force, if it has any, should rest on the fact that baptism on behalf of the dead involves a belief in the resurrection of the dead,

and draws its significance from that belief. But *all* baptism proceeds on precisely the same belief, and this kind of baptism rests on no special difference of principle as to the resurrection, but upon a mere peculiarity of opinion as to the efficacy of baptism. There is, then, really no more pertinence in the inquiry, "why are they baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not?" than in asking, "why are they baptized at all, if the dead rise not?" The import of this species of baptism is no more nullified by the denial of the resurrection than that of ordinary believer's baptism, and the apostle has needlessly dragged in a superstitious observance to point an argument which is just exactly as forcible, and far more dignified, without it.

But again: the form of the question, "What will they do who are baptized," etc., is unsuited to this meaning. Meyer's interpretation of the *τί ποιήσουσι*, viz., what sort of a thing, how foolish and absurd a thing will they do, is forced and inadmissible. That should rather require *τί* or *ποῶν ποιοῦσιν*, or some such form. Rückert's "will they not cease to do it?" is worthy of the rest of Rückert's interpretation of this passage. The true meaning of the phrase is (as substantially De Wette and Alford), what will they gain? what will they do? how will they get on? what will become of them? The question marks not merely the folly of the act, but its folly and uselessness *for those who perform it*. The question thus, under the interpretation we are considering, becomes entirely inappropriate. It should be, in effect, "How useless a thing do they do who are baptized for the dead! What will those dead persons do or gain, for whom living men are baptized?" As it *is*, the question indicates not that the *dead* are expected to be benefited, but the living persons who are baptized for them, and the folly of their action lies not in its failure to benefit the dead, but to benefit themselves. The second form of the Apostle's question would, indeed, admit of either application. But this as more general, is to be explained by the more specific form of the first; and we here call attention, both as discrediting this interpretation, and pointing to the true one, to the fact that the apostle's question clearly indicates the absurdity

of the action, not in its bearings on the dead, but on the living persons who undergo the baptism.

Our final objection to the exposition in question, we believe even more decisive. It does not suit the context. It is not in harmony with the Apostle's train of thought. It foists an irrelevant, impertinent, disturbing idea into a line of sentiment otherwise natural, coherent and impressive. In order to show this, we must ask the reader to turn back to the passage, and follow us in subjecting it to a careful analysis. He will see that the Apostle treats the subject under two aspects, a negative and a positive, and that this makes really two divisions of that entire passage (from v. 13 to v. 34) in which he treats of the *fact* of the resurrection. The negative part states with Apostolic authoritativeness the disastrous consequences which flow from a denial of the resurrection. The positive part with equal authoritativeness *affirms* the resurrection, basing it on the resurrection of Christ, and following it out to its glorious consequences in the utter annihilation of death, and the consummation of the kingdom of God. The second or positive portion, is interposed as a sort of digression between the sundered sections of the negative, and extends from v. 20, "But now *is* Christ risen," to v. 28, "that God may be all in all." The first or negative portion begins with v. 13, and runs on to v. 20, where it is broken by the introduction of the other positive, triumphant strain of sentiment which the impatient ardor of the Apostle would allow him no longer to defer. At v. 29, when the fiery impulse under which he had bounded off and made his eagle flight into the seventh heaven, is exhausted, he returns to finish out that sad and gloomy picture, and show the deniers of the resurrection what a cheerless contrast they were creating to the blessed and glowing hopes of the gospel.

This in general. Let us trace the line of thought more particularly. It is perfectly simple and easy to follow. There is, properly speaking, no reasoning and no attempt at any. The Apostle speaks simply as one who *knows*. If the dead rise not, Christ is not risen. The resurrection of Christ involves the resurrection of his people. The non-resurrection of his

people argues back to the non-resurrection of their Lord, and with this comes tumbling down, in melancholy and hopeless ruin, the whole structure of Christian faith and hope. By logical necessity, the non-resurrection of Christians involves the non-resurrection of Christ. Jesus perished in the sepulchre, and in that same grave are buried all the prospects, and hopes, and joys of his followers. The preaching of him is vain; faith in him is vain; they who have fallen asleep in him, have perished; and his disciples consequently — such is the inevitable inference — sacrificing the present with no hope of the future, the victims of self-denial, suffering, persecution, peril, death, are the most miserable of all men. Thus far the course of thought is transparently clear, nor can there be any reasonable doubt as to the import of *ἐλεεινότεροι*, *more miserable*, with which this section closes. It refers not, certainly not primarily, to any subjective and ideal misery, growing out of the terrible contrast between the Christian's anticipations and the reality. He is not called the most miserable of men because, having been exalted so high in hope, he is subjected to so dire a disappointment. This were bad enough, doubtless, but this is not what the Apostle means, and is in fact a sort of refining foreign to his mental habits. He has in mind a much sterner and more practical, though perhaps homelier truth. He refers to the actual sufferings, sacrifices, imminent and deadly perils which encompassed the path of the followers of the Crucified. Their Christian profession made them universally odious. They were the victims, always of hate, and often of persecution. Between their own principles and popular proscription, they were cut off from nearly the whole circle of worldly pleasures. Stigmatized by the communities whose idolatries, vices, and pleasures they shunned and reprobated, as bigoted and fanatical sectaries; their peace always, and their lives often in jeopardy; and so far as safe, safe only because despised, their conduct might surely be denounced as supremely foolish, their lot as supremely miserable, if their hope after all was but an illusion and a lie. "The faithful," says Bengel, commenting on the passage, "have an intimate, present joy in God, and therefore are now happy; but if there is

no resurrection, their joy is greatly impaired." Such is not the scope of the Apostle. He knows no true joy of believers apart from the resurrection. Their joy is not merely impaired, it is *annihilated*. Their hope is not merely circumscribed, it is extinguished. Life and immortality are brought to light by the gospel, and guaranteed by the resurrection of Christ. Expunge that fact, and a heavier than Egyptian night resettles on all the region which the gospel had illuminated, and Patriarchs, Prophets and Apostles, the Old Covenant and the New, all belong to one stupendous scheme of imposture and illusion.

Let us not be misunderstood. That Paul actually drank deep daily draughts of present spiritual joy, we cannot for a moment question. But this does not, cannot, enter into his argument, for, deprived of its support in a living Christ, this joy is an absolute nullity. The fountain cut off, what becomes of the stream? The Sun of the moral heavens blotted out, what are any fancied rays but mockery? His hope and faith deprived of every particle of genuineness and vitality, outlawed from the present world, and with no asylum in the future, the Christian sinks into the most miserable of men. Let Paul be his own interpreter. "If the dead rise not, why stand we in peril every hour? Why do I die daily? Why did I contend with the wild beasts of Ephesus?" We need not hesitate therefore. The misery spoken of is no ideal product of the contrast between a glorious hope and a wretched realization; it is the hard, stubborn, palpable, objective misery of a life of unrewarded sacrifice, suffering, and danger.

Here the Apostle breaks off. Impatient of dwelling on a comfortless and dreary view — and false as comfortless — he turns upon his readers the reverse side of the picture — a picture glowing with the positive fact of the resurrection of Christ, and its blessed consequences in the resurrection of his people, and the destruction of man's great enemy, death. This affirmative and triumphant strain culminates at v. 28, in the reversion of the world's sovereignty to the hand of absolute Deity. The impulse which had prompted and borne up his flight being exhausted, the Apostle then turns back to complete

his negative portraiture. "For," he adds with his mind on the darker hypothesis and its consequences, "what shall they do who are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not? Why do even we stand in jeopardy every hour? I protest, I die daily," and so on to the "let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." It is thus most apparent that at v. 29 he resumes in the same strain in which he had broken off at v. 19: that he is giving the darker aspects of the case, and that—certainly with the exception of v. 19 itself—all is a continuation and expansion of the ἐλεεινότεροι, *more miserable*, above. This determines, we think, the commencement of the digression, and shows how far back we are to refer the ἐπεὶ *since*. Meyer, indeed, denies any digression, and refers the ἐπεὶ to the passage immediately preceding. This is simply absurd. The remoter reference is recognized by nearly all the commentators, and our analysis makes clear to what it is to be referred. The negative view of the case, commenced at v. 13, is suspended at v. 19, and after the interposition of the positive view, is resumed in the same strain at v. 29, and carried forward to the emphatic "Be not deceived," etc., of v. 33.

It is not necessary, indeed, to maintain that the Apostle, in resuming with ἐπεὶ, had a definite reference to any particular passage or expression. It is sufficient that his mind was filled with the general idea of the wretched consequences flowing from the denial of the resurrection, and that, after having fully set forth the positive and glowing *fact*, he now returns to complete the darker delineation, and show fully to the Corinthian speculators over how dreary a gulf they were hanging. With this general thought filling his mind, and crowding for utterance, nothing would be more natural than to resume really as if the thread had not been broken, while in fact v. 29 is connected not so much with v. 19 as with the idea in his mind out of which both spring.

At all events, v. 29 really takes up the thought where the ἐλεεινότεροι, *more miserable*, had left it, and carries it forward with a natural development. Passing over our present passage, how unmistakably true is this of all the rest! Why stand *we* in peril every hour? "I die daily." "If after the

manner of *men* merely, with no hope of an hereafter, I fought with wild beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me?" And how natural the crowning conclusion, "If the dead rise not, let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die!"

We are justified in taking this entire negative together, as constituting a coherent whole. Look at the "more miserable" above; look at that series of expressions which form its commentary below. Let us briefly sum up the whole, and see how simple, natural, harmonious, and forcible the line of thought. 'No resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen. Then is your faith vain: then they that have fallen asleep in Christ have perished. Then we Christians, with our numberless sacrifices and sufferings, are the most miserable of men. For what, in that case, will they gain who are baptized for the dead? Why do also we encounter peril every hour? Why do I die daily? Why did I contend with the wild beasts of Ephesus? All our sufferings, exposures, dangers, how utterly gratuitous! Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die!' Now we ask, in all earnestness, what place in this line of thought for such an idea as that of baptizing living persons for the benefit of dead ones? We leave out of the account the intrinsic grossness of the superstition; the utter improbability of its existing at Corinth; the still greater improbability of Paul's alluding to it with seeming favor; the futility of the argument in itself. But, we ask, what makes it here? What connection or coherence has it with the line of thought? What is it but an impertinent intruder, marring the symmetry and disturbing the course, as well as degrading the dignity, of the Apostle's natural and just appeal? All the rest is legitimate; this is illegitimate. All the rest declares that without the resurrection Christians are preëminently miserable. This declares that, without the resurrection, a certain superstitious observance loses its significance. All in the connection goes to show that the Christian's lot, apart from the resurrection, is peculiarly wretched. This would show no such thing. The most that can be said of this is, that it is a mere nullity—that neither Principal nor Substitute has either gained or lost any thing by the transaction. Both are just as well off as before,

and the reference is as completely out of place in the connection, as it is futile in respect to argument, and improbable as to the fact.

The phrase "baptized for the dead," *ought*, it should seem, in its place, to refer in some way to those sufferings and woes to which Christianity subjects its votaries. Nothing but this fits into the context. And, we add, the form of expression—the manner in which the passage is coupled with the following, leads to the same conclusion. "Why are they baptized for the dead? Why do also we stand in peril every hour?" It is impossible to avoid the conviction that these two sentences stand in close connection as to the thought: that one continues, explains, or modifies the other; that it is either the expression in literal language of what the other has expressed figuratively, or a more restricted statement of what the other has declared generally. Two ideas of so diverse a character as that of a gross superstition and legitimate and noble Christian exposure, cannot be thus yoked together by a writer even more careless and unstudied than Paul. Paul often obscures his logic by terse and abrupt expression, but he does not thus force together ideas logically unrelated and incoherent. "Baptized for the dead" ought in the connection, to express an idea akin to those of the "stand in jeopardy," "die," "fought with wild beasts," that follow, and all together are natural developments of the "more miserable," their starting point above.

We have thus far dealt with the facts and the logic of the matter. We have looked at the historical evidence, the nature of the usage, and finally at the logical exigencies of the passage. We regard this latter evidence as decisive, both as to what the meaning of the passage is not, and what it is. We have no right, indeed, to force our own meaning into an author's train of thought, but we have a right to draw his meaning out of it. We may rightly presume that he will lead us toward the goal toward which his footsteps are regularly tending. We may surely make logical consistency an important element in interpretation. Man is something more than a mere grammar-grinder. The Lexicon is not the whole of exegesis. Logic and rhetoric—the law of thought and the

law of passion — are mightier than grammar, and will ever furnish the most decisive elements in the interpretation of human speech. We can never rest in our exposition until the logical demands of the passage are satisfied. However seemingly encompassed in grammatical rules, it will refuse to lie still, but will arise and haunt us with the ghost of a murdered thought. When, on the contrary, the difficulties of thought have resolved themselves, we easily dispose, especially in an energetic and impassioned writer, of some difficulties of expression. Not, however, that we here encounter any serious difficulties of expression. We shall find the language easily yield to the demand of the thought.

The same analysis of the train of thought which rules out the idea of baptizing living persons for dead ones, excludes some other explanations intrinsically much less objectionable. If our analysis is just, the passage *ought* to have reference in some way to the folly of Christian sacrifices and sufferings, in case the dead do not rise, for this is here the scope of the Apostle's thought. Christians, by all the hardships and perils which their profession entails upon them, are by so much worse off than other men — this is here the burden of his thought — the *last* thought with which he broke off at verse 19, and the *only* thought which he dwells upon after verse 29. The explanation, therefore, often adopted, "baptized for [the resurrection of] the dead," though easily drawn from the words by a natural elipsis, and in itself a pertinent and forcible question, is not pertinent just here. The Apostle is not arguing for the resurrection from the import of rites and ceremonies, whether regular or heretical, but simply showing how completely wretched its denial makes the believer. But a baptism for the resurrection of the dead, if the dead do not rise, is merely a nullity. Like the heretical baptism before spoken of, it leaves the person precisely where it found him. It amounts to nothing either way. His condition is no better and no worse: or, rather, if that were *all*, it would be better, for he has his hope in the present life, and then — why, "out of nothing nothing can arise, not even sorrow." The explanation then is inappropriate. The question which the Apostle should

ask, is not, why are they baptized for the *resurrection* of the dead? but, why are they baptized for the *dead*? Not, why in baptism do they look beyond the grave? but, why in baptism do they devote themselves to the *grave*? Why do they undergo a baptism which brings them into sure alliance with the dead, if the dead have no resurrection? Why hasten to that goal, if that goal is nothingness or destruction?

And this thought, so appropriate to the context, and so germane to the argument of the Apostle, lies, we believe, on the very face of the expression; may be drawn out from it by no violent process. Before inquiring how this may be done, let us look, for a moment, at the meaning of the word *ὅπερ*. It first means *over*, locally, but in this sense is unknown to the New Testament. It means, secondly, *on behalf of*, *for the sake of*, (*over*, for defence,) and then by a slight extension, *in reference to*, *in relation to*; the two classes of meanings so playing into each other that it is sometimes difficult to distinguish them. Of both uses, however, the instances are abundant. In the latter sense (*in reference to*,) it differs from *περί concerning*, as implying an *interest* in the person or thing referred to. Thus, any person might speak *περί γραφῆς concerning an indictment*, but *ὅπερ τῆς γραφῆς* naturally only one of the interested parties. The fundamental idea in all such cases of *ὅπερ* is that it brings the parties into close relation with its object, the precise nature of the relation, whether friendly or antagonistic, being determined by the circumstances. Of another possible, but very rare meaning of *ὅπερ*, as equivalent to *ἀντί instead of*, we doubt if there is any clearly authenticated case in the New Testament. The passages where it is so rendered admit easily the meaning *on behalf of*. "Baptized for the dead" then is, with no straining of the words, baptized into relation to the dead, baptized so as to be allied with the dead, reckoned among the dead rather than among the living. The extreme brevity and abruptness of the expression may make it doubtful in what precise way its general import is best evolved. We glance at two or three explanations.

1. Bengel explains, baptized over the dead, not literally, but figuratively — baptized, as it were, overhanging the

dead—with death and the dead immediately before one. This, in one of his applications, viz., to martyrs, would be in keeping here. But it is harsh, and may be dismissed as improbable.

2. We have, again, Rosenmüller's interpretation, "*qui se maximis vitæ periculis exponunt ut moriantur.*" This takes βαπτίζω figuratively—overwhelmed, plunged in affliction and peril for the sake of, so as to ally themselves to, the dead. This construction we incline to believe possible. The figurative uses of βαπτίζειν in Greek are abundant, and not always with any determining object in the immediate connection. Nor is it easy to say how far the striking language of our Lord to his disciples in regard to his and their baptism of suffering, may have influenced the use of the word among primitive Christians. Nor is the harshness of the connection with ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν, in our view, an insuperable objection to this meaning, which, of course, fits perfectly to what follows. Still, in the absence of clear cases of like usage, it is safer, perhaps, to take the verb literally.

3. We have, then, thirdly, two ideas either of which may be drawn out of the phrase. The first makes it have respect to the *universal* significance and effect of baptism, in that Christians, by their baptism on the one hand, renounce all the pleasures and enjoyments of life, thus linking themselves ideally to the dead, and on the other at once subject themselves to the peril of death, and bind themselves to maintain their fidelity at the expense of life. Such was emphatically the condition of primitive baptism. In other senses than the purely spiritual, they who were baptized into Christ, were baptized into death. The very condition of discipleship was *taking up the cross*, having the sentence of death in themselves,—a devoting of themselves to death. Thus their baptism, as the symbol of their Christian profession, was both in its ideal character, as a denial of the pleasures and interests of life, and in its actual character, as exposing them to suffering and peril, from which they must not shrink, emphatically a baptism for the dead.

There are two objections to this interpretation. First, of a

literal baptism, we might expect the participle βαπτισθέντες, rather than the continued present βαπτίζόμενοι. But to this we may reply, that while each baptism was a single event, the Apostle, looking at a series or succession of baptisms, would naturally use the present. The other objection is, that the form of expression, "What will they do who are baptized," etc., seems naturally to apply to only a portion of Christians, to separate a part from the whole. He should have said, "What shall we do," etc. For this we have, perhaps, no entirely satisfactory answer. We might indeed regard the οἱ βαπτίζ. as a descriptive term, standing here for all Christians, and employed precisely because it here suits the writer's purpose. An American might be writing of some duty devolving upon his countrymen as Republicans, and as a synonym for the entire body say, "For those who profess democratic principles, cannot but," etc. The "those who profess" would here be coextensive with the previous term "Americans," and so the οἱ βαπτίζ. may here be coextensive with the whole body of Christians, as universally descriptive of them. In this way we deem it possible to regard the passage as applicable to all Christians — especially of that early time — in that feature of their Christian profession which made it virtually a taking up of the cross, and allying themselves to the dead.

But, secondly, it may refer, as οἱ βαπτίζόμενοι would naturally indicate, not to the whole body of Christians, but only to a part. It then denotes, not the necessary condition of all baptism, but the baptism of those whom their Christian profession subjected to actual suffering, peril, and perhaps martyrdom. Of these, especially of such as underwent death for Christ's sake, it would surely be no harsh language to say that they were "baptized for the dead;" that they underwent a baptism which destined them for and allied them to the dead. As to the *thought*, look at the Apostle's frequent language elsewhere, "God hath set forth us the Apostles last as it were appointed unto death;" "For always we that live are delivered unto death;" "I die daily;" "In deaths oft." And take the entire passage, II Cor., xi: 23-28, as an emphatic commentary on the *idea* of being baptized for the dead and the whole fol-

lowing portion of the passage. And as to the *expression*, it is determined by the subject about which the Apostle is writing. His mind is here on *the dead* (οἱ νεκροί) with reference to their resurrection, and nothing would be more natural for him than to assimilate the phraseology in which he describes deadly suffering to the language of the context, and thus to set over against the resurrection of the dead a "baptism for the dead" as emphatically and justly descriptive of their earthly life, at least of that of himself and his fellow-preachers and propagators of the gospel, who, wherever they went, went in the very face of martyrdom. The figure is an energetic, impassioned one, but by no means unnatural.

We confess we feel half disposed to adopt Rosenmüller's figurative interpretation, and to regard the verb, thus used, as sufficiently explained by the context. But the literal explanation is perhaps easier, yields an equally good sense, and is only less rhetorically forcible. That idea is, baptized for the *dead*—baptized into relation to the dead, so baptized as that they belong, by sacrifice, suffering, peril, martyrdom—rather to the dead than to the living, and are thus the victims of a fate which has no alleviation nor apology, except in the resurrection. And we trust we have shown the utter untenableness of that interpretation which refers the passage to a usage elsewhere unheard of in the New Testament, nor heard of in the church for three centuries afterward, and heard of then only among some ignorant and fanatical sectaries.

We close with two remarks, —first, we ask attention to the simplicity of our interpretation. It is not elaborate and far fetched. It depends on no subtle and ingenious combinations. We have not brought it from afar. We have not ascended into heaven to bring it down from above, nor descended into the deep to bring it up from beneath. The word is nigh us. We reach it by the simplest evolution of the writer's thought. It lies on the very face of the passage, and is the only solution which clears the thought of the writer, while nothing in the language repels us from it. If the mere literal, mechanical structure of the words, without thought of history, logic, or intrinsic force, favors the view of Alford and De Wette, a

slight regard to that impassioned element which enters so largely into the style of Paul, makes our explanation easy and natural. And if Paul might be expected to speak with impassioned energy anywhere, it would be in dealing with the deniers of the resurrection.

Once more. We would dwell a moment on the common fallacy that Paul is adducing a series of arguments in proof of the resurrection. Nothing can be more unfounded. When he comes to the *mode* of the resurrection, he cites two or three analogies which give his discussion the appearance — though it is little *but* the appearance — of an argument. But here there is not the shadow of any *argument* in the proper sense of the term. The Apostle simply *affirms* on the one hand that without the resurrection there is no risen Christ, no Christian hope, and all is gloom, wretchedness and despair; and on the other affirms the resurrection of Christ with its glorious consequences in the resurrection of his people, and the destruction of death. There are simply two authoritative statements, — negatively, that the non-resurrection of the dead implies the non-resurrection of Christ; positively, that there *is* a resurrection of Christ, guaranteeing the resurrection of his people. All is involved in this. On the negative side the course of thought is: If Christ is not risen, Christian hope is vain, Christian sacrifices and sufferings are futile; the Christian's lot is supremely wretched, and his baptism for the dead but plunges him prematurely into that sleep of death which knows no awakening, that night of the grave on which dawns no morrow.

ARTICLE VII. — RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Introduction to the Pentateuch ; an Inquiry, critical and doctrinal, into the Genuineness, Authority, and Design of the Mosaic writers.
By the REV. DONALD MACDONALD, M. A., Author of "Creation and the Fall." Vols. I., and II. Edinburgh : T. & T. Clark. 1861.

No portion of the sacred Scriptures has been more virulently and persistently assailed than the *Pentateuch* ; the authority and credibility of none have been more positively denied. The grounds of attack have come to be well understood even by general readers, while the true methods of defence have been familiar to but few minds. The works of Hengstenberg and Hävernick and Kurtz, though translated into English, have lain under the disadvantages of a foreign type of thought, and of the inevitable aridity of all mere translations. There was urgent need, therefore, for just such a work as Mr. Macdonald has undertaken to supply.

His task has been a laborious one. The research and ingenuity brought to bear against the *Pentateuch*, were not to be met by the easy methods of a professional book-maker. The bare literature of the subject includes historical criticism, philology, physical science and biblical theology. But Mr. Macdonald seems to have gone to his work with very just conceptions of both its requirements, and its difficulties. He has evidently surveyed the whole field of inquiry, and after examining minutely every argument for and against the Divine-Mosaic origin of the *Pentateuch*, has endeavored to make a strictly honest report. There is a tone of impartiality and candor throughout the volume which retains the confidence of the reader at every stage of the argument. The author never descends from the high position of an unprejudiced investigator to the low level of a mere advocate. And if we fail to discover the evidences of original investigation, which we find in Hengstenberg, we yet have that which is far more acceptable to the vast majority of readers, a complete view of the whole question of the

authority and genuineness of the *Pentateuch*. We could wish the author had been more full in his discussion of the relations of Physical Science to the first chapters of Genesis, and more thorough-going in his defence of the Divine character against impeachment founded on certain representations of it in other parts of the Mosaic records. In the reading of other portions of his volumes, we have also felt that one who could write so good a work, should have written a better; but we frankly confess ourselves only too thankful for the volumes as they are, to indulge in any criticism. There is an imperative need of them, and they are invaluable. We heartily wish for them a wide circulation and a careful reading among those who are set for a defence of the Gospel, and of the whole Bible. They may be obtained, like other publications of the same house, from Mr. Charles Scribner, New York.

Commentary on the Epistles to the Seven Churches in Asia. Revelation II., III. By RICHARD CHEVENIX TRENCH, D. D., Dean of Westminster. New York: Charles Scribner, 124 Grand Street. Published by arrangement with the author. 1861.

No living Englishman publishes so much that is at the same time so valuable as Dean Trench. Though prolific he is not hasty. In the publication of the present volume he "accomplishes a wish which he has cherished for a large number of years." The *Commentary* is a model of its kind, and expounds one of the most instructive and attractive portions of the New Testament. It will help to rescue the Apocalypse from that neglect into which, with too many, it has unhappily fallen.

The author regards the epistles to the seven churches as primarily addressed to the churches named, but also, by the mystic number seven, "in some sort representing the Universal Church," and so "offering to us the great and leading aspects, moral and spiritual," of Christian churches for all time. He rejects, however, with special disclaimer, the historico-prophetical theory of interpretation, to the discussion of which he devotes an excursus at the end of the volume. The Dean, like a good churchman, as he is, regards the "angel of the church" as its bishop, and so finds an incidental argument for episcopacy. A specimen of ingenious solution of a difficult question will be found in his explanation of the "white stone with a new name," which he regards as an allusion to the Urim and Thummim that scholars have so long been perplexed about. We commend the volume to all preachers of the gospel, as one that will well repay a careful perusal.

Theological and Homiletical Commentary on the Gospel of St. Matthew. Specially designed and adapted for the use of Ministers and Students. From the German of J. P. LANGE, D. D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Bonn. By the REV. ALFRED EDER-SHEIM, Ph. D., Author of History of the Jewish Nation, etc. etc. Vol. I. Edinburgh : T. & T. Clark. 1861.

LANGE's is one of those inventive, imaginative minds that discover luxuriant meadows, where duller souls can see only common fields. He has been a prolific writer, and pours forth copiously on whatever he writes. Nothing, however, that he has written is more worthy of translation into our language, than this Commentary. In his plan, but by no means in his execution, he more nearly resembles Matthew Henry or Thomas Scott, than he does any modern expositor. He makes large, yet discriminating use of the results of latest criticism, and in his theory of inspiration is much sounder than the great majority of modern Germans. His Commentary will prove specially acceptable and profitable to all who are called to instruct the people from the Word of God.

A Grammar of the Hebrew Language. By WILLIAM HENRY GREEN, Professor in the Theological Seminary, at Princeton, N. J. New York : John Wiley. 1861.

It has frequently been a matter of remark and regret, that so few graduates from our Theological Seminaries, ever become proficient in Hebrew. The fact may be explained in part, perhaps, by the insufficiency of time given to its study in the Seminary, and by the comparatively late period of life at which the study is begun — a period so soon followed by the engrossing cares of public life, as to leave but little leisure for its prosecution. But other causes exist ; among which is undoubtedly to be mentioned, inadequate helps to its study. Whoever, then, gives us a new Hebrew Grammar, with ever so slight an improvement on its predecessors, contributes towards the making of more and better Hebrew scholars. Prof. Green has made a valuable contribution to this end.

He has made free use of the labors of Gesenius, Ewald, and Nordheimer, and has attempted to "combine whatever is valuable in each." Numerous other grammars have also been consulted. He adopts Ewald's explanations of the laws of vowel changes in nouns, and consequently rejects the declensions of Gesenius as "purely artificial." Each word is accented with a uniform sign, which will be of special

service to beginners. One special recommendation of Prof. Green's grammar, is that its rules are never illustrated by supposititious forms, but by actual examples from the Old Testament, the whole grammar thus furnishing, what is most needed and is of invaluable service to the student, a large collection of the phenomena of the language as it is found in the Hebrew Bible.

Historical Lectures on the Life of our Lord Jesus Christ, being the Hulsean Lectures for the year 1859, with Notes, critical, historical and explanatory. By C. J. ELLICOTT, B. D., Professor of Divinity, King's College, London; late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge; author of Critical and Grammatical Commentaries on St. Paul's Epistles. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co. Cincinnati: George S. Blanchard. 1862.

THE Christian scholars of England are at last beginning to wake to the duties required of them. Until recently they have slumbered and slept, while the enemy has been diligent in transferring from the German to their language, some of the very worst products of Rationalism. Grave churchmen have been rapidly yielding to the demands of unbelief. The practical sense of England is beginning to show its strength and clear-sightedness, in a careful reëxamination of the Biblical records under the light of modern criticism, and in a thorough vindication of the original facts of revelation which they narrate. No one is in this way showing more of the better qualities of English mind and scholarship, or using these qualities with greater effect, than Prof. Ellicott. His commentatary on the Epistle to the Galatians will have given pledge to American readers of his competency for the task undertaken in these Lectures.

Under the eight following topics — Characteristics of the Four Gospels, The Birth and Infancy of our Lord, His Early Judean Ministry, His Ministry in Eastern Galilee, His Ministry in Northern Galilee, Journeyings toward Jerusalem, The Last Passover, and The Forty Days — the author has succeeded in grouping all the principal facts in the life of Christ, especially the controverted ones, recorded by the four Evangelists. The text of the Lectures is lucid in its arrangement, attractive in its style, and will have a charm for all classes of readers. The Notes which, though printed in much smaller type than the text, occupy from a third to a half of the bulk of the volume, are closely packed with the solid results of patient and protracted investigation. In them are discussed the many questions of harmony and of fact

over which modern scepticism has made so much ado. No one who has read Neander's or Hase's Life of Christ, should fail to read Ellicott's.

History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ.

By Dr. J. A. DORNER, Professor of Theology in the University of Göttingen. Division Second, from the end of the fourth century to the present time. Vol. I. Translated by Rev. D. W. SIMON, Manchester. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1861.

This history is distinguished even in German Theological Literature, for its thorough research and careful discrimination. It traverses the whole field of Christological speculations, from the generation succeeding the Apostles down to men now living. Clear insight into theories and lucid analysis of their principles are everywhere apparent, while the author's mastery of the literature of his subject is complete. Nothing has escaped him. His idea of development is that of a simple historical unfolding of the doctrinal germs which are found chiefly in concrete forms, in the authoritative sacred Scriptures. No work of modern Germany is more worthy of a careful translation into English.

Dorner's History is arranged under two great "divisions;" the volume now published being the first of division second, and extending from the year 381 to the decay of Scholasticism. The translation is a very free rendering of the original, and is readable, and what is yet more, is generally very intelligible English. The volumes of the first division are to be translated by Rev. Dr. LINDSAY ALEXANDER. The whole work, when translated, will prove an invaluable addition to our language.

Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church, with an Introduction on the Study of Ecclesiastical History. By ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, D. D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford, and Canon of Christ Church. London: John Murray. 1861. pp. 512.

We look for an early reproduction of Dr. Stanley's Eastern Church on this side of the water. It is a book which will stimulate curiosity, and will reward it. It is not a work after the copiously learned and thorough-going style of Dean Milman's Latin Christianity. It is not a history, but lectures on the history of the Eastern Church. As such it is executed with the highest art. It is a book full of zest, which carries one on with its own impetus, and gives pleasure in the reading, as well as a

substantial result. Those who use the author's "Sinai and Palestine," know his excellent constructive skill. He knows how to be learned without being so painfully and laboriously dull as some first class authorities in ecclesiastical history succeed in being.

The Lectures turn on three points : that which centres in the council of Nicaea, Mahometanism in its relations to the Eastern Church (one lecture), and the Russian Church. What we may call the scenery of that famous Nicene Council, the personal and local, no less than the religious aspect of it, is really painted, and with the rich severity of a picture of Vandyke or Lessing. The Russian Church opens a field obscure and remote, yet where Eastern Christianity, as a power quite distinct from Western, has been making the principal part of its history. With the West, its church, its doctrine and history, we are related, and familiar. The East is less studied and less known. Dr. Stanley, in these lectures, will be a most inspiring guide into that dim region, which after all is nearer the true home and sources of our faith, and in some respects nearer its original doctrine and practice than the Latin Church. That church is with us against the Latin in the doctrine of baptism. We quote a paragraph on this point, and with the greater satisfaction, because it contains the testimony to our views of so liberal and competent a scholar as the Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Oxford. "There can be no question that the original form of baptism — the very meaning of the word — was complete immersion in the deep baptismal waters; and that, for at least four centuries, any other form was either unknown, or regarded as an exceptional, almost a monstrous case. To this form the Eastern Church still rigidly adheres; and the most illustrious and venerable portion of it, that of the Byzantine Empire, absolutely repudiates and ignores any other mode of administration as essentially invalid." (page 34.)

The three Introductory Lectures on the Province, the Study, and the Advantages of Ecclesiastical History are fresh, comprehensive, liberal, and perhaps as suggestive and profitable as any part of the book. The conception of the idea and the method of history is not profound, touching what seem to us the deepest springs of its life. But no student will read the volume without great pleasure and benefit, and we had almost said, without the wish that the author could have had his skilful hand in some of the painful works, and especially text-books which the reader of Church History is obliged to use.

A Text-Book of Church History. By Dr. JOHN C. L. GIESELER. Translated and edited by HENRY B. SMITH, Professor in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. Vol. IV.—A. D. 1517–1648. The Reformation and its Results to the Peace of Westphalia. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers.

The merits of Gieseler as a historian are such as not only distinguish him from all other historians of the Church, but secure him from being supplanted by the labors of any other. Whatever may be alleged against his history itself as arid and lifeless, his copious and accurate citations of authorities place before the reader in briefest form possible the reasons for every statement, and thus furnish to the student of history what is of more value than the opinions of any single author, viz: materials out of which intelligent opinions may be formed for himself. This fourth volume covers the whole period of the Reformation from its beginning to the peace of Westphalia, and contributes what was both the favorite and most thoroughly wrought portion of the author's whole history. It supplies a want in our language which has been long and painfully felt by all students of the history of the Reformation. Of the translator, who has also lent the helping hand of an editor, we need only say that no one does his work more thoroughly.

The Puritans: or the Church, Court and Parliament of England, during the reigns of Edward VI., and Queen Elizabeth. By SAMUEL HOPKINS, in three volumes. Vol. III. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1861.

THE third, last, largest, and most important volume of this valuable History is now before the public. It differs very little, if at all, in its characteristics from the preceding ones, though it lets us more into the heart of Puritan life and ideas, because it brings us nearer to the full maturing of their principles and plans.

The completed history confines itself, as the title page of its first volume promised, to the reigns of Edward VI., and of Elizabeth. The present volume, like the others, is diversified with admirable sketches and vivid pictures, though we could wish the author had more uniformly restricted himself to the simple office of the historian than he has done, and less frequently entered on that of an advocate of the Puritans. Their case would, we think, stand quite as well in the estimation of the reader, had the author been content with a simple recital of their story. But the many excellences of the work should shield it even from this minor criticism.

Memorial Volume of the First Fifty Years of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. Boston. Published by the Board. Missionary House, 33 Pemberton Square. 1861.

THAT was a great day for the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, when they assembled in Boston, October 2d, 1860, for the celebration of their first semi-centennial anniversary. It was a day of high religious rejoicing, and was fitly celebrated. Nothing could be more natural and appropriate than the commemoration of the half century of missionary labors and successes, by a memorial volume of history, and no fitter historian could have been selected than the honored secretary, Rev. Dr. Anderson, who for nearly forty years has been intimately connected with the correspondence and operations of the Board. The volume is one of great interest and instruction to all readers, and is particularly worthy of study by all persons who are exercised about a true theory and method of Christian missions.

Our Country and the Church. By N. L. RICE, D. D. New York: Charles Scribner, 124 Grand Street. 1861.

THE Rev. Dr. N. L. Rice has long been known in sundry cities of the West as a faithful preacher of the Gospel and a facile disputant with the Catholics, Campbellites, and heretics in general. At present he is the successor of the honored and lamented James W. Alexander in New York city. He has felt himself called to publish two sermons preached by him on the Sunday preceding the late National Fast. The first is creditable to its author, but the second contains more sophistry than we can now remember ever to have seen in a single sermon. Its author's proposal to exclude from the pulpit all moral questions connected with "constitutional or civil questions," on the ground that the former "depend upon" the latter, which, by common consent, are not to be discoursed in the pulpit, is simply too absurd to need refutation.

Lectures on the English Language. By GEORGE P. MARSH. New York: Charles Scribner, 124 Grand street. 1861.

WE uttered in hearty terms our appreciation of the learning and ability, and admirable taste and skill, exhibited in these Lectures, when the first edition appeared, and now, on the appearance of a *fourth* revised and enlarged edition, we would only repeat the more heartily what we then said. It fills an unoccupied and most important place in our literature.

A Compendium of Classical Literature ; comprising choice Extracts, from the best Greek and Roman writers, with Biographical Sketches, translated Accounts of their Works, and Notes directing to the best editions and translations. Part I.—from Homer to Longinus. Part II.—from Plautus to Boëthius. By CHARLES DEXTER CLEVELAND, formerly Professor of the Latin and Greek Languages in Dickinson College, and of the Latin Language and Literature in the New York University. Philadelphia : E. C. and J. Biddle & Co.

THE plan of Prof. Cleveland is to introduce his writers chronologically, and to give selections from their writings, either in the translations of the most approved authors, or from his own pen. One remarkable peculiarity of these translations is their spirit and naturalness. They read much more like original compositions in English, than like translations of what was written thousands of years ago. The book supplies just what is wanted by many intelligent readers, who, ignorant of the Latin and Greek, are yet desirous of knowing something of the writers and writings of those languages.

Elijah ; a Sacred Drama, and other Poems. By ROBERT DAVIDSON, D. D. New York : Charles Scribner. 1860.

DR. DAVIDSON undoubtedly has the true poetic spirit. We could easily quote from him lines, couplets, and passages of striking beauty, and we could with equal ease instance others of bad rhythm and infelicitous rhyming ; but in so doing, we should only prove that the author, though a poet, has not devoted himself to the poetic art. His version of the *Dies Iræ* has stanzas, which, for *exact* and happy rendering, may well challenge the attention of the most critical.

The Works of Washington Irving. Author's Revised Edition. Wolfert's Roost. New York : G. P. Putnam, 532 Broadway. 1861.

THE beautiful "national edition" of Irving's works has been completed by the publication of *Wolfert's Roost*, the whole set consisting of twenty-one volumes. The indefatigable Putnam, undaunted by the times, will proceed to issue simultaneously on the first of January, Volume I. of the Caxton edition of Bayard Taylor's prose writings, in ten volumes, and of the Aldine edition of Thomas Hood's works in six volumes. These will continue to appear, one volume a month, till completed.

The Breath of Life. By GEORGE CATLIN, with twenty-five illustrations. New York : John Wiley. 1861. Price, 25 cents.

MR. CATLIN has been long and widely known as a trustworthy writer on the manners and customs of American Indians. In this pamphlet he, now an old man, comes before the public in a new character, as the *quasi* discoverer of what he regards as one of the most important, as well as one of the most frequently violated, laws of human health. Free use is made of his knowledge of Indian habits in the illustration of the law. The law itself is, simply, inhalation through the nostrils, instead of through the open mouth. It is to a violation of this law that he would attribute not only diseased teeth and diseased lungs, but a long catalogue of ailments. He doubts if even yellow fever and cholera could be infectious, if people would sleep with their mouths shut. It would be easy to turn much of this pamphlet into ridicule, but after all it contains many a useful hint which thousands might profitably act upon.

A Manual of Elementary Geometrical Drawing, involving three dimensions. Designed for use in High Schools, Academies, Engineering Schools, etc., and for the self-instruction of Inventors, Artizans, etc., In five divisions. I., Elementary projections ; II., Details of Constructions in Masonry, Wood and Metal ; III., Rudimentary Exercises in Shades and Shadows ; IV., Geometrical Drawing ; V., Elementary Structural Drawing. By S. EDWARD WARREN, C. E., Professor of Descriptive Geometry and Geometrical Drawing in the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, N. Y. ; and author of a Treatise on the Orthographical Projections of Descriptive Geometry. New York : John Wiley, 56 Walker Street. 1861.

THE design of this small volume is sufficiently indicated by its title. It is thoroughly scientific, and must prove very serviceable to all students of engineering, and to any one seeking initiation into the mysteries of the draftsman's art.

Messrs. Sheldon & Company will, in a very few days, issue the second volume of Dr. H. B. Smith's greatly improved and enlarged edition of Hagenbach's History of Doctrines. They will also publish, between this and the first of March, Marsh's revised edition of Wedgwood's Etymological Dictionary. The same house have become the publishers of Bullions' well known series of English and Classical text-books. Bullions' Latin and Greek Grammars, his Latin and Greek Readers ; and his editions of

Sallust, of Cicero's Orations and of other authors, still retain their place, notwithstanding the growing multitude of similar works. This speaks well for his method and his accuracy. This house also publish Cooper's Virgil, which so many teachers regard as still the best edition of the poet that can be put into the hands of the pupil. They also publish Comstock's Chemistry and Comstock's Natural Philosophy, both of which are well and favorably known by all teachers of the elements of these sciences. They are also the publishers of several valuable Algebras, such as Stoddard & Henkle's University Algebra, and an Elementary Algebra by the same authors; another by Professor Dodd of Transylvania University, and yet another noticed by us in our last number, by Professor Strong of Rutgers College. All the above books are bound in substantial sheep, and fitted for the hard usage of student life and habits.

FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

The Lutheran *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, Heft IV., 1861, contains A. G. Rudelbach's "Confessions," Mehring on the "Angel of Jehovah;" Schott, Essays on the Epistles to the Corinthians, 3; H. G. Hasse, The Romish Question in its general ecclesiastical aspects, with a copious bibliography.

Titus, Bishop of Bostra, the capital of Arabia Felix, was a strenuous defender of Christianity in the times of the Emperor Julian. The Greek fragments of his work against the Manichæans, edited by Paul A. de Lagarde, with the Epistles of Julius Romanus, and a treatise of Gregory Thaumaturgus, appeared at Berlin, 1859. 8vo.

Dr. F. Delitzsch has published a third and thoroughly revised edition of his Commentary on Genesis. Delitzsch's views and sympathies are decidedly evangelical, and he is one of the most learned and successful biblical commentators of our time.

The doctrinal system (Lehrbegriff) of the Epistle to the Hebrews, by K. A. Riem, Privatdoc. in Heidelberg, has been published in three parts, which, we believe, complete the work. The *Lutherische Kirche*, etc., bestow on it the highest praise for clearness, sound judgment, and thorough investigation.

Dr. W. Bessell, Privatdoc. in Göttingen, has published a learned

work of 120 pages on the life of Ulfilas, and the conversion of the Goths, a subject which has, within a few years, received light from new and special investigations. The chronological conclusion of Bessell's work, is that Ulfilas, who died in his 70th year, was born toward the beginning of the year A. D. 311. He was bishop forty years,

A Work on the "Christian Church of the Middle Ages, in the chief points of its Development," by Dr. F. C. Baur, of Tübingen, has been published since his death, by Prof. Dr. F. F. Baur.

Dr. H. Hupfeld has completed, with the fourth volume, his translation and interpretation of the Psalms. The price of the complete work is \$8.

Dr. C. F. Keil (known as an able Old Testament commentator) and F. Delitzsch have commenced a Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament. The first volume (592 pp.) of the first part, contains Genesis and Exodus by Keil. The work must be important to Old Testament students.

Dr. K. F. A. Kahnis, author of the very able work on the Internal History of German Protestantism (of which a new edition has recently appeared), has also commenced a work on the Lutheran doctrinal system, its origin and history. I. Vol., 690 pp.

Prof. Dr. Schirlitz has a work on the Fundamental Features of the Greek of the New Testament, for students in Theology and Philology. 444 pp.

Dr. F. Ueberweg has published Inquiries regarding the genuineness and chronological succession of the writings of Plato, and on the chief events in Plato's life. It consists of 304 pages, and received the prize from the Imperial Academy of Sciences in Vienna.

From T. Schott, Erlangen, we have a Commentary on the First Epistle of Peter, of considerable merit.

L. Diefenbach published in 1839-40, a work on the Lettic or Lithuanian dialect and people. He has recently published a more extended work, entitled "*Origines Europææ*," which, making the Celtic nation and language the central point of its investigations, expands itself so far over neighboring and kindred races, as to justify the above title. The second part contains the Lexicon and the Celtic words and phrases, preserved by the Ancients. It is a valuable aid to the student of general philology.

There has appeared the first volume of a new Commentary on the Gospel of John, by Prof. Hengstenberg of Berlin.

Dr. F. H. Th. Allihnu has written a work on The Fundamental Doctrines of General Ethics, with a treatise on the relation of religion to morality. From H. U. Chalybäus, we have a work entitled Fundamental Philosophy : an attempt to establish the System of Philosophy

on a Real Principle. From Prof. J. W. Hanne, The Idea of an Absolute Personality ; or, God and his relation to the world, particularly to human personality. A work by Dr. H. Ulrici, on God and Nature. 639 pages.

L. Friedländer has published Selections from the Correspondence of the philologist Lobeck, with a literary appendix, and a discourse in honor of his memory.

A work from A. Sprenger on the Life and Doctrines of Mohammed, from sources in great part new, will comprise two volumes. The first has appeared.

Dr. H. Lämmer, known by his church-historical researches in Roman libraries and archives, publishes a new fruit of his studies, under the title, Vatican Monuments illustrating the Ecclesiastical History of the Sixteenth Century. These records, drawn from the secret archives of the Vatican, shed a clear light over the commencement and progress of the Reformation of the sixteenth century.

A. F. Aken has written a work of 284 pages, on the Doctrine of Tense and Mode in the Greek language, exhibited historically and comparatively. W. Baumlein, a work of 324 pages, containing Investigations on the Greek Particles.

Fr. Heimsoeth has published a work on the Restoration of the Dramas of Æschylus : The Sources. An introduction to a new recension of Æschylus. 500 pages.

A. Meincke, the distinguished classical philologist, has published an edition of the Antigone of Sophocles, and a tract of 56 pages, entitled Contributions to the Philological Criticism of the Antigone.

The November number of the *Missionsblatt der Gemeine getaufter Christen* (Missionary Paper of the Church of Baptized Christians), contains the following curious extract from a book of *Bugenhagen*, one of Luther's most celebrated fellow-laborers in the work of the Reformation. The book appeared in 1542, under the title of *Christliche Bedenken und Unterricht für die Frauen* (Christian Advice and Instruction for Women). In an explanation of Psalms xxix : 10, occurs the following :

“ When I was at Hamburg, A. D. 1529, I acted as godfather, and perceiving that the minister took the infant in its dress and swaddling-clothes, and baptized it merely on its head, I was terrified (*da erschrock ich für*), because I had never seen nor heard such a thing, nor had I read in any history that it had ever been done, except in times of need to the *clinici*.

“ Upon this, I called all the pastors and the most prominent preachers

together, who said that this was an old custom with them. When I asked one of them, Magister John Fritzs, you have been preacher at Lübeck; in what manner is baptism performed there? He, being a pious, upright man, answered earnestly, Infants are baptized naked at Lübeck, as they are everywhere in Germany; whence it comes that here they act differently in baptism, I do not know.

"We finally concluded that we would keep silent about the matter, in order that no offence might be taken. For it was to be apprehended that, by our contending against this abuse, the people might be led to suspect that their children, who heretofore, by way of this abuse, ignorantly, yet with a sincere design, had been baptized, might not have received the true baptism of Christ. How could the poor infants help it? They are brought to Christ to be received by Him, are baptized with water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. In case of need, when the infant seemed to be dying in its swaddling-clothes, we would have done the same, and would have considered the infant as being truly baptized. The needless abuse is not the fault of the infant, but of those who administer, and those who order baptism. Still, be it done ignorantly or not, it is an abuse. Therefore we will keep silent, until we get an answer from our dear father Martin Luther, and the theologians who are with him.

"Now, Father Luther wrote us at Hamburg, that *it was an abuse which must be done away*; yet so, that in our public teachings we should guard against all offence that might be taken; or against exciting suspicion, that the children baptized heretofore had not received the real baptism of Christ, etc. This we did, as the people at Hamburg know well, in the name of the Lord."

From the above statement the reader will naturally infer, that good old Bugenhagen, or *Doctor Pommer*, as he was familiarly called from his native province, Pomerania, contended for *immersion* as the proper mode of infant baptism. Such however was by no means the case. For he afterwards states, that in 1537 he visited Denmark, and during a two years stay at Copenhagen was again requested to act as godfather. He confidently and joyously expected to see the "*trina immersio*" practiced, which, he says, "*I had often read about, but never seen*;" but, alas! he was again doomed to disappointment. The infant received the rite in the same manner as at Hamburg. Upon this he asked the pastors, when and why the trine immersion, according to Christ's command, which had existed in Denmark from the beginning, was abolished, and this *new abuse* substituted for it. They told him, that certain unauthorized men: (Umbleuffer, i. e., men running

about) at the time, when the Reformation was first introduced into Denmark, had commenced this *innovation*. Bugenhagen immediately commanded them, "*to baptize the children naked, by pouring over, as in Germany, for such, according to the command of Christ, is equivalent to dipping or immersion. This they did joyfully receive in Denmark, Christ be eternally praised. Amen.*"

Thus it clearly appears that at the time of Luther and Bugenhagen, neither immersion nor sprinkling was practised in Germany, but a *middle mode*. The infant, it seems, was held over the baptismal fount and water poured over its entire body, upon which, according to various allusions in Luther's writings, the infant was dressed in a clean white shirt (*westerhemd*). This middle mode probably formed the transition from immersion to sprinkling. Bugenhagen seems to have been fully aware, that in earlier times *immersion* was practised, which he preferred; yet as he probably considered it impossible to introduce it, he felt it his duty to contend for the *pouring of water* over the entire body, as being at any rate preferable to *sprinkling*.

It further appears from these extracts, why, whenever any "new abuse" had sprung up in the administration of baptism, it could not be abolished, but became at once permanent. For on account of the sacredness of the rite, which was believed to confer on the candidate regeneration and adoption into the covenant with God, it seemed dangerous to convey to the minds of the people the slightest apprehension that any "baptisms" already performed might not be valid.

We add another curious statement, which shows that among the early Lutherans speculations and inquiries existed, concerning the *subjects* as well as concerning the *mode* of baptism. In Ulrich's Church History (Second part, page 177), we read the following: "It is quite remarkable, that at the commencement of the Reformation some Lutheran Churches considered infant baptism as indifferent, *i. e.*, as a matter of "Christian liberty," neither urging any one to it, nor persecuting those who omitted it, nor deterring any one from practising it. Thus, a Lutheran minister of that time says: "Instead of performing baptism, I call the church together, take the infant and explain the Gospel according to Matthew, chap. xix., "there were then brought unto him little children." Upon this I give the infant a name, and the people kneel down and pray for it, commending it into the hands of Christ, that He may be gracious unto it. But if the parents are as yet weak and earnestly demand that the infant be baptized, I baptize it, thus to the weak becoming for a time as weak, until they are better instructed."